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### Arguing Negative On The Space Topic

Aaron Hardy and Jim Hanson, Whitman College

Below you will find a general overview of the negative side of the 2012-2013 Transportation topic, as well as specific descriptions of responses to affirmative cases, disadvantages, counterplans, and critiques. You can argue that current plans to develop US infrastructure are sufficient and should not be expanded. You can argue that increases in investment are actively harmful and would actually make problems worse. You can argue that the disadvantages of increasing investment, such as the cost or the political backlash would outweigh the benefits of the affirmative plan. You can argue that different agents could better implement plans. Use this topic overview as a starting point for your research into the negative side of the Transportation topic.

**Case Responses**

Be prepared to defend the present system of US transportation infrastructure. Research evidence and arguments that refute the harms that affirmatives are likely to present. Use the affirmative topic analysis included in this handbook to prepare for likely affirmative cases and research attacks against their solvency. Here are some of the many possible negative responses you can make to affirmative cases:

• Current plans for US transportation investment are adequate – the Obama administration is refocusing efforts on improving US transportation infrastructure, and state government are also aware of problems and bottlenecks in the current system. The negative could also argue that private industry will ensure solving the affirmative harms in the future, for example by investing in airports and high-speed rail to make a profit.

• Focusing on transportation is the wrong focus – there are many problems with the US economy and competitiveness, and time and resources devoted to transportation infrastructure may take decades to see effects. Those resources may be better spent on other forms of stimulus or taking steps to improve US competitiveness in other areas.

• Be prepared to really go after the solvency of affirmative plans. Remember, the topic only allows affirmatives to increase investment – not guarantee that the results of that investment will be productive. The affirmative must defend that their plan will actually work or succeed at reducing the harms. To win that they solve many of the largest impacts, this will require the affirmative to win that many new technologies are developed, that the economics will work out in favor of their program, and that it is even possible to catch up to other countries transportation investments. If any of these programs were simple or guaranteed, we likely would have done them by now. This also means that many of the problems with current transportation policy are also potential solvency attacks against affirmative plans. Failed past projects and things which politicians have failed to support as too “pie-in-the-sky” are just two examples of the types of evidence you can use to support your solvency arguments. Remember, you should both show why the affirmative proposal won’t work and why it will make things worse. This will make your solvency arguments as strong as possible.

As the year progresses, new affirmatives will emerge and you will need to research and strategize to defeat them. Use the arguments presented here to jumpstart your research. Against any new affirmative, be sure to defend the status quo, attack the significance of the affirmative’s harms, and attack the affirmative’s solvency. This strategy is sure to put you in a good position to win a debate over the affirmative’s case.

**Disadvantages**

Here are disadvantages you and others might prepare against increasing transportation infrastructure investment:

• Infrastructure Tradeoff disadvantage: increasing the amount of investment in transportation infrastructure may tradeoff with investment in other forms of critical infrastructure, such as the electricity grid or US water systems. Failure to make investments in those types of infrastructure might be more harmful than letting transportation languish – such as enabling a bioterror attack on US water supplies, or causing a power grid collapse that caused nuclear plants to meltdown.

• Politics disadvantage: The plan could be argued to either help or hurt Obama’s political agenda. Transportation policies are frequently unpopular because they are perceived as too expensive, or because they spread the cost to many while only benefiting a few. On the other hand, transportation programs can be very popular when they benefit specific constituencies, or when they are perceived as very necessary. Passing popular or unpopular programs could give President Obama increased or decreased ability to pursue other, potentially harmful policies.

• Elections disadvantage: The 2012 presidential elections are shaping up to be extremely important politically, as they could impact whether the country maintains course with Obama’s policies for the next four years. For many of the same reasons mentioned above, the plan could have important political effects in how the electorate views Obama and the Democrats more broadly.

• Spending disadvantage: Almost all forms of transportation investment are extremely costly. Programs to fix US highways (much less build a space elevator) could cost billions of dollars. The US is already running huge fiscal deficits – and spending a great deal of money which the US doesn’t currently have could have negative effects on the US economy.

• Federalism disadvantage: Investments in local infrastructure could be considered the domain of state governments, rather than the target of federal investment. Taking over functions normally reserved by the constitutions for the states might harm the balance of state and federal power. This could in turn damage the power of the US model to other countries, resulting in government collapse or wars.

**Counterplans**

Here are counterplans on the Transportation topic:

• Private Sector counterplan: instead of involving the government in transportation investment, this counterplan carries out the mandates of the affirmative via the private sector. This could take the form of government provided incentives, or just fiat that another actor do the plan. This counterplan has the benefit of avoiding politics and spending disadvantages by not involving the government, and might argue that private companies would be better equipped to develop US transportation infrastructure.

• States counterplan: Many affirmatives will lack a good reason why only the federal government can enact the plan. This counterplan argues instead that all 50 states should implement the plan in their respective states. This has the advantage of avoiding downsides to federal action, such as the federalism disadvantage or politics disadvantage. This is likely to be one of the most popular counterplans on the topic, due to its general applicability.

• Advantage counterplans: since so many affirmatives on the topic share the same goals – improving the US economy and competitiveness, for example, there will be many affirmative ideas which could be re-used as counterplans when debating a different case. For example, against a case which improved US highways, the negative might read a counterplan to build high-speed rail instead, and argue that highway investments would be detrimental.

• Plan-inclusive counterplans: this is an entire category of counterplans, rather than one specific plan. These counterplans advocate part of the affirmative plan, while excluding the rest and claiming the benefit of excluding the parts of the plan that link to disadvantages. For example, a plan-inclusive counterplan against an affirmative which invested in US roads and highways could advocate only investing in US roads, and claim that investing in highways would detract from investments in better forms of long-distance transportation, such as airports or high-speed rail..

Kritiks

What kinds of kritiks may be run on this year’s topic? Here goes:

• Security kritik: this kritik argues that affirmative plans which attempt to avoid “security” impacts such as wars by improving the US economy and position of leadership in the world lead to a cycle of insecurity through threat construction. This might extend to criticizing representations of conflicts or security concerns. The kritik rejects this way of describing the world and says we should instead use more positive representations or discourse.

• Speed kritik: this kritik argues that US transportation infrastructure is built around a concept of technological sophistication which emphasizes the increasing speed at which people can travel and experience the world. This, in turn, causes people to relate to the world in negative ways, and do things like destroy the environment or rely on technology too much. The kritik would reject this way of thinking and avoid using modern transportation infrastructure.

• Capitalism kritik: this kritik argues that the root cause of problems on Earth is the existence of capitalism. It argues that policy proposals which attempt to develop US infrastructure and the economy without dealing with the core problem will simply result in replicated the problems of Capitalism, and that the only way to truly solve is to reject the whole capitalist system.

• Race kritik: this kritik will argue that the impacts of US transportation investments are not experienced equitably by people of different races. For example, investments in US highways only benefit people who have a car – while ignoring the impact of higher taxes on the urban poor. This kritik will argue that these racist assumptions should be rejected.

• Coercion kritik: this kritik will argue that the only legitimate function of government is to provide for the common defense and protect private property – and that things like US transportation infrastructure should be provided by private enterprise. The kritik will argue that it is immoral for the government to tax people in order to fund public works projects like transportation, and that this form of government coercion should be resisted at all costs.

## Topicality

### The

#### ‘The’ Means Unique

Merriam-webster's online collegiate dictionary, 2007.

Accessed May 10, 2007, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

b -- used as a function word to indicate that a following noun or noun equivalent is a unique or a particular member of its class <the President> <the Lord>

#### ‘The’ Means All Parts

Merriam-webster's online collegiate dictionary, 2007.

Accessed May 10, 2007, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

### United States

#### The united states is the executive, legislative, and judicial branches

Princeton university wordnet 1997,

Online, accessed May 15, 2007, http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=united%20states

united states: 2: the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the US

#### United states is the united states of america

The american heritage dictionary, 1983,

p. 857.

United States: Also United States of America. Country of central and NW North America, with coastlines on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Arctic oceans. Cap. Washington, D.C. Pop. 226,504,825.

#### United states is the states within territorial bounds

American heritage dictionary, 2nd college edition, 1988.

United States: A federation of states, esp. one forming a nation within a definitely specified territory: politicians who proposed a United States of Africa.

#### United states means a union of states

The oxford english dictionary, 1989.

United States: The proper name or distinctive title of a confederacy, federation, or union of States.

#### United states means the united states of america

The oxford english dictionary, 1989.

United States: The Republic of North America. Abbrev. U.S. or U.S.A.

#### United states are a federation of states

Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary, 1988.

United States: a federation of states esp. when forming a nation in a usually specified territory (advocating a United States of Europe)

#### The united states is the 48 states plus hawaii, alaska and d.c.

The oxford encyclopedic english dictionary, 1991.

United States of America: a country occupying most of the southern half of North America and including also Alaska in the north and Hawaii in the Pacific Ocean, comprising 50 States and the Federal District of Columbia.

### Federal Government

#### Federal government is administered by a union or confederation of states

Black’s law dictionary. 1979,

Black, Henry Campbell. p. 550

Federal Government: The system of government administered in a nation formed by the union or confederation of several independent states.

#### Federal government is control and influence by the central government

Dictionary of american politics, 2nd edition, 1968.

Federal Government: In the United States: the Government which, from its capital in the District of Columbia, directly legislates, administers, and exercises jurisdiction over matters assigned to it in the Constitution and exerts considerable influence, by means of grants-in-aid and otherwise, over matters reserved to the State governments.

#### Federal government means the central government

Dictionary of american politics, 2nd edition, 1968.

federal government: In the United States: the Government which, from its capital in the District of Columbia, directly legislates, administers, and exercises jurisdiction over matters assigned to it in the Constitution and exerts considerable influence, by means of grants-in-aid and otherwise, over matters reserved to the State governments.

#### Federal government means the central government in washington dc

Dictionary of american politics, 2nd edition, 1968.

federal government: In the United States: the Government which, from its capital in the District of Columbia, directly legislates, administers, and exercises jurisdiction over matters assigned to it in the Constitution and exerts considerable influence, by means of grants-in-aid and otherwise, over matters reserved to the State governments.

### Should

#### Should expresses obligation or desirability

Webster's new world dictionary, 3rd edition, 1988.

p.1242.

used to express obligation or duty, propriety, or desirability.

#### Should is different from would

Webster’s new universal unabridged dictionary, 1983.

Should: 2b. expectation or probability: e.g., since they left Saturday they should be here by Monday: equivalent to ought to and replaceable by would.

#### Should can be replaced by would

Webster’s new universal unabridged dictionary, 1983.

Should: 2d. futurity in polite or unemphatic requests or in statements with implications of uncertainty or doubt: replaceable by would: e.g., should (or would) you like some tea? I should (or would) think he’d like it.

#### Should means past tense of shall

Webster’s new universal unabridged dictionary, 1983.

p. 1679.

1. past tense of shall.

### Substantially

#### Substantial means “large”

Oxford english dictionary, 2nd ed, 1989.

[substantial:] Of ample or considerable amount, quantity, or dimensions. More recently also in a somewhat weakened sense, esp. ‘fairly large.’

#### Substantial means large

Webster’s new world dictionary, 1988.

p.1336

Substantial 4. considerable; ample; large

#### Substantial means considerable in quantity

Merriam-webster’s collegiate dictionary. 1993,

p. 1174

Substantial 2b. Considerable in quantity.

#### Substantially is considerable or large

The american heritage dictionary, 1983,

p. 678.

Substantially 5. Considerable; large; won by a substantial margin.

#### Substantially means truly, largely, essentially

Webster’s new universal unabridged dictionary, deluxe second edition, 1983

Substantially: 2. to a substantial degree; specifically, a. truly; really; actually; b. largely; essentially; in the main.

#### Substantial means important

Black’s law dictionary. 1979,

p. 1280 Black, Henry Campbell.

Substantial Something worthwhile as distinguished from something without value or merely nominal.

#### Substantial means of real worth and importance

Black's law dictionary, 6th edition, 1990,

p.1428

Of real worth and importance.

#### Substantial means important

The american heritage dictionary. 1982, p. 1213

Substantial 5. Considerable in importance, value, degree, amount, or extent.

#### Substantial means of considerable or vital worth

Webster’s new universal unabridged dictionary, deluxe second edition, 1983

Substantial: 6. of considerable worth or value; vital; important; as, they agree on all substantial issues.

### Increase

#### Increase means to make greater

Random House, 2010, “Increase,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase

–verb (used with object) 1. to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment; add to: to increase taxes.

#### Make greater

Collins English Dictionary, 2009, “increase,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase

— vb 1. to make or become greater in size, degree, frequency, etc; grow or expand

#### Increase means to make greater

Merriam-Webster, 2010, “increase,” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/increase

transitive verb 1 : to make greater : augment

### Its

#### “Its” is the possessive form of the pronoun “it”

Random House Webster's College Dictionary (1991)

Its: the possessive form of IT (used as an attribute adjective) The book has lost its jacket. I'm sorry about its being so late.

#### Its means of or belonging to the noun referenced as “it”

Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd Ed, 1989

Of or belonging to it, that thing.

#### Its is possessive or genitive of “it”

CHAMBERS 20TH CENTURY DICTIONARY, 1983.

Its: possessive or genitive of it.

#### Its is of or relating to “it” as the subject or object of an action

WEBSTER'S NINTH NEW COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY, 1988.

Its: adj. of or relating to it or itself esp. as possessor, agent, or object of an action (going to its kennel) a child proud of its first drawings) (its final enactment into law).

### Transportation Infrastructure

#### Transportation Infrastructure is a bunch of stuff

Chantal C. Cantarelli, Prof @ Delft, et al, March 2010, “Cost Overruns in Large-scale Transportation Infrastructure Projects,” EJTIR, http://www.ejtir.tbm.tudelft.nl/issues/2010\_01/pdf/2010\_01\_01.pdf

We define transportation infrastructure projects as follows: ‘Transport infrastructures include

roads, rail lines, channels, (extensions to) airports and harbours, bridges and tunnels. Of these

projects it is the ‘hardware’ that is considered, and the “software”,i.e. projects relating to

deregulations, liberalization, privatization, and so forth is excluded’. The literature did not

provide one minimum cost level that is generally applied to mark a large-scale project. A largescale project is defined in this paper by a minimum cost level of 500 million euros.

#### Transportation infrastructure is the transport provisions in a location

Economic Development Services, 2-26-2011, “glossary,” http://www.findmehere.com/search/dictionary/t\_index.htm

define transportation infrastructure: ... transport provisions in a location; the services and facilities of conveyance other than those of utilities and communication as they support ongoing economic activity in an area. Transportation may be seen as a header for a category of location data, for example, on a community profile. Transportation along with communications infrastructure, demographics, real estate and taxes and incentives are arguably the most sought after information by prospects. Transportation as a item of location data typically covers water, air, and ground facilities, vehicles and services that part of the infrastructure of an area.

#### Transportation infrastructure includes this stuff

Wikipedia, 6-1-2012, “Infrastructure,” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Infrastructure#Transportation\_infrastructure

Transportation infrastructure Road and highway networks, including structures (bridges, tunnels, culverts, retaining walls), signage and markings, electrical systems (street lighting and traffic lights), edge treatments (curbs, sidewalks, landscaping), and specialized facilities such as road maintenance depots and rest areas Mass transit systems (Commuter rail systems, subways, tramways, trolleys and bus transportation) Railways, including structures, terminal facilities (rail yards, train stations), level crossings, signalling and communications systems Canals and navigable waterways requiring continuous maintenance (dredging, etc.) Seaports and lighthouses Airports, including air navigational systems Bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways, including pedestrian bridges, pedestrian underpasses and other specialized structures for cyclists and pedestrians Ferries For canals, railroads, highways, airways and pipelines see Grübler (1990),[13] which provides a detailed discussion of the history and importance of these major infrastructures.

### Transportation

#### Transportation is a means of conveyance

American Heritage, 2000, “transportation,” Free Dictionary, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/transportation

trans·por·ta·tion (trnspr-tshn) n. 1. a. The act or an instance of transporting. b. The state of being transported. 2. A means of conveyance. 3. The business of conveying passengers or goods. 4. A charge for public conveyance; fare. 5. Deportation to a penal colony.

#### Transportation is a means of transport

Random House, 2012, “transportation,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/transportation

1. the act of transporting. 2. the state of being transported. 3. the means of transport or conveyance. 4. the business of conveying people, goods, etc. 5. price of travel or transport by public conveyance; fare.

#### It’s a means of conveyance

Merriam-Webster, 2012, “transportation,” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/transportation

1: an act, process, or instance of transporting or being transported 2 : banishment to a penal colony 3 a : means of conveyance or travel from one place to another b : public conveyance of passengers or goods especially as a commercial enterprise — trans·por·ta·tion·al adjective See transportation defined for English-language learners » See transportation defined for kids » Examples of TRANSPORTATION the transportation of troops overseas She arranged for the transportation of her furniture to her new apartment. He was the U.S. Secretary of Transportation under President Reagan.

### Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure means the aggregate of facilities for society

Infrastructure Definition, 2011, “Infrastructure Definition,” http://infrastructuredefinition.com/

In everyday life one often comes across the word ‘infrastructure'. Do you know what this word means? There isn't only one infrastructure definition; there are many definitions of the word infrastructure. One such definition is the basic structure of a company or an organization. The word infrastructure is rarely used as a noun. The other definition of infrastructure is that it is the aggregate of all those capital equipment and basic facilities which are very much needed for a society or enterprise to function. This infrastructure could be anything from roads to power grids to telecommunications to sewers to water supply to bridges to flyovers. Basically it is a word which encompasses all those services or facilities which are required and absolutely essential otherwise an economy would not be able to function. Infrastructures such as flyovers, bridges, water supply, power grids, roads, etc denotes the technical structures which are essential for the proper functioning of a society.

#### Infrastructure is the basic framework

Merriam-Webster, 2012, “infrastructure,” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/infrastructure

1: the underlying foundation or basic framework (as of a system or organization) 2 : the permanent installations required for military purposes 3 : the system of public works of a country, state, or region; also : the resources (as personnel, buildings, or equipment) required for an activity

#### Infrastructure is the base or foundation

American Heritage, 2000, “infrastructure,” http://www.thefreedictionary.com/infrastructure

1. An underlying base or foundation especially for an organization or system.

2. The basic facilities, services, and installations needed for the functioning of a community or society, such as transportation and communications systems, water and power lines, and public institutions including schools, post offices, and prisons.

### Investment

#### Investment is putting money into something to appreciate

Investopedia, 2012, “Investment,” http://www.investopedia.com/terms/i/investment.asp#axzz1wWTv9785

An asset or item that is purchased with the hope that it will generate income or appreciate in the future. In an economic sense, an investment is the purchase of goods that are not consumed today but are used in the future to create wealth. In finance, an investment is a monetary asset purchased with the idea that the asset will provide income in the future or appreciate and be sold at a higher price.

#### The act of investing money into something

Collins English Dictionary, 2009, “investment,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/investment

investment (ɪnˈvɛstmənt) — n 1. a. the act of investing money b. the amount invested c. an enterprise, asset, etc, in which money is or can be invested 2. a. the act of investing effort, resources, etc b. the amount invested 3. economics the amount by which the stock of capital (plant, machinery, materials, etc) in an enterprise or economy changes 4. biology the outer layer or covering of an organ, part, or organism 5. a less common word for investiture 6. the act of investing or state of being invested, as with an official robe, a specific quality, etc 7. rare the act of besieging with military forces, works, etc

#### Investment is trying to make more money

Investor Words, 2012, “investment,” http://www.investorwords.com/2599/investment.html

Definitions (2) 1. In finance, the purchase of a financial product or other item of value with an expectation of favorable future returns. In general terms, investment means the use money in the hope of making more money. 2. In business, the purchase by a producer of a physical good, such as durable equipment or inventory, in the hope of improving future business.

### In

#### In means within

American Heritage, 2000, “in,” http://www.thefreedictionary.com/In

in 1 (n) prep. 1. a. Within the limits, bounds, or area of: was hit in the face; born in the spring; a chair in the garden. b. From the outside to a point within; into: threw the letter in the wastebasket. 2. To or at a situation or condition of: was split in two; in debt; a woman in love. 3. a. Having the activity, occupation, or function of: a life in politics; the officer in command. b. During the act or process of: tripped in racing for the bus. 4. a. With the arrangement or order of: fabric that fell in luxuriant folds; arranged to purchase the car in equal payments. b. After the style or form of: a poem in iambic pentameter. 5. With the characteristic, attribute, or property of: a tall man in an overcoat. 6. a. By means of: paid in cash. b. Made with or through the medium of: a statue in bronze; a note written in German. 7. With the aim or purpose of: followed in pursuit. 8. With reference to: six inches in depth; has faith in your judgment. 9. Used to indicate the second and larger term of a ratio or proportion: saved only one in ten. adv. 1. To or toward the inside: opened the door and stepped in. 2. To or toward a destination or goal: The mob closed in. 3. Sports So as to score, as by crossing home plate in baseball: singled the runner in. 4. Within a place, as of business or residence: The manager is in before anyone else. 5. So as to be available or under one's control: We can proceed when all the evidence is in. 6. So as to include or incorporate: Fold in the egg whites. 7. So as to occupy a position of success or favor: campaigned hard and was voted in. 8. In a particular relationship: got in bad with their supervisor. adj. 1. Located inside; inner. 2. Incoming; inward: took the in bus. 3. Holding office; having power: the in party. 4. Informal a. Currently fashionable: the in thing to wear this season. b. Concerned with or attuned to the latest fashions: the in crowd. See Synonyms at fashionable. 5. Relating to, understandable to, or coming from an exclusive group: an in reference. n. 1. One that has position, influence, or power: the ins against the outs. 2. Informal Influence; power: had an in with the authorities. Idioms: in for Guaranteed to get or have: You're in for a big surprise. in on Informed about; participating in: Only one business partner was not in on the illegal scheme. in that For the reason that.

#### In means included in a space

Random House, 2012, “in,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/in

in   [in] Show IPA preposition, adverb, adjective, noun, verb, inned, in·ning. preposition 1. (used to indicate inclusion within space, a place, or limits): walking in the park. 2. (used to indicate inclusion within something abstract or immaterial): in politics; in the autumn. 3. (used to indicate inclusion within or occurrence during a period or limit of time): in ancient times; a task done in ten minutes. 4. (used to indicate limitation or qualification, as of situation, condition, relation, manner, action, etc.): to speak in a whisper; to be similar in appearance. 5. (used to indicate means): sketched in ink; spoken in French.

#### In means within

Merriam-Webster, 2012, “in,” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/in

a —used as a function word to indicate inclusion, location, or position within limits <in the lake> <wounded in the leg> <in the summer> b : into 1 <went in the house> 2 —used as a function word to indicate means, medium, or instrumentality <written in pencil> <bound in leather> 3 a —used as a function word to indicate limitation, qualification, or circumstance <alike in some respects> <left in a hurry> b : into 2a <broke in pieces> 4 —used as a function word to indicate purpose <said in reply> 5 —used as a function word to indicate the larger member of a ratio <one in six is eligible>

## Transportation Advantage Core Neg

### Uniqueness – Competitiveness Will Increase

#### Demographics will boost US competitiveness.

David Bloom and Jay Lorsch, Professor of Economics and Demography at the Harvard School of Public Health and Professor of Human Relations at the Harvard Business School, 3/8/2012, “Demographics Could Give the U.S. a Competitive Edge,” http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2012/03/demographics\_could\_give\_the\_us.html

The March issue of HBR on U.S. competitiveness strikes a pessimistic tone about certain demographic facts — the education gap between young people and the jobs which are and will be available, the aging of the American population, and the related rise in health care costs. However, we see one striking omission about demographic patterns in the U.S., one that could create a resurgence in competitiveness compared to other wealthy industrial countries. The number of children per woman (TFR, or "total fertility rate") has fallen less rapidly in the U.S. than in other industrialized countries. For example, the rate in Western Europe is 1.7, as compared with 2.1 in the U.S. It's 1.5 in Italy and Spain. This disparity has prevailed for decades and has of course affected the growth rate of entrants into the prime working-age years. Indeed, between 2000 and 2010, the annual average growth rate of 20- to 29-year-olds in the U.S. was 1.3%. The corresponding figures for the U.K., Germany, France, Italy, and Japan are 1.1%, 0.3%, 0.2%, -2.0%, and -2.5%. This relative dearth of new entrants into the workforce is projected to continue in other industrialized countries. By contrast, the supply of workers in the U.S. will continue to be strong, partly because fertility has not fallen all that far and partly because of continuing immigration. With a steady or growing labor force, the U.S. will benefit from the fact that working-age citizens are the biggest savers. Savings fuel investment, capital accumulation, and R&D spending. In addition, a steady supply of workers is vital for the fiscal integrity of social security and health care systems.

#### Competitiveness already bouncing back.

Daniel Gross, columnist and economics editor for Yahoo! Finance, 5/10/2012, “The Myth of American Decline,” HBR interview, http://blogs.hbr.org/ideacast/2012/05/the-myth-of-american-decline.html

JUSTIN FOX: I take it from reading your book that you don't think it's all over for the US economy. DANIEL GROSS: Not by a long shot. Look at some of the metrics. The stock market has doubled, essentially, in the last three years. We've regained our 2007 peak economically. Obviously, we're behind in jobs. And most of the numbers are moving in the right direction. It's retail sales, industrial production, exports. A lot of the big data that we look at have been moving in the way we want them to move for the last three years. Now obviously, big outliers like housing. But we had a pretty severe housing bubble, and those take a long time to get over.

#### Tide is turning – US manufacturing and exports bouncing back.

Harold L. Sirkin et al, senior partner and managing director in the Chicago office of The Boston

Consulting Group, August 2011, “Made in America, Again,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/64261145/BCG-Made-in-America-Again

Once again, however, predictions of the demise of American manufacturing are likely to prove wrong. The U.S. manufacturing sector remains robust. Output is almost two and a half times its 1972 level in constant dollars, even though employment has dropped by 33 percent. Despite the recent wave of outsourcing to China, the value of U.S. manufacturing output increased by one-third, to $1.65 trillion, from1997 to 2008—before the onset of the recession—thanks to the strongest productivity growth in the industrial world. Although China accounted for 19.8 percent of global manufacturing value added in 2010, the U.S. still accounted for 19.4 per-cent—a share that has declined only slightly over the past three decades. The conditions are coalescing for another U.S. resurgence. Rising wages, shipping costs, and land prices—combined with a strengthening renminbi—are rapidly eroding China’s cost advantages. The U.S., meanwhile, is becoming a lower-cost country. Wages have declined or are rising only moderately. The dollar is weakening. The workforce is becoming increasingly ﬂexible. Productivity growth continues

### Uniqueness – AT: China Surpassing the US

#### US already re-gaining ground – other countries facing new disadvantages.

Washington Post, 1/17/2012, “U.S. losing high-tech manufacturing jobs to Asia,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/us-losing-high-tech-manufacturing-jobs-to-asia/2012/01/17/gIQA9P1S6P\_story.html

Just as China and other Asian countries appear to be gaining in engineering, however, other factors at work are expected to give a boost to U.S. manufacturing by making it more competitive with China. Wages in China have been growing rapidly, lessening their advantage over those in the United States. Moreover, increasing automation in the United States is lowering labor costs. Finally, analysts said, U.S. workers are far more productive. “When you add all this up together, there’s a lot of opportunity in the U.S.,” said Eric Spiegel, chief executive of Siemens, which has 65,000 employees and 137 manufacturing plants in the United States. “There’s still more skilled labor here than anywhere else in the world.” Within five years, the cost gap between the United States and China to produce many goods consumed in North America will be virtually closed, according to a recent report from the Boston Consulting Group. “China’s overwhelming manufacturing cost advantage over the U.S. is shrinking fast,” the report said.

#### China won’t undermine US competitiveness.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, 2/29/2012, “How Big a Competitive Threat Is China, Really?” http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2012/02/how\_big\_a\_competitive\_threat\_i.html

Thus, the question: Is China becoming a serious economic competitor to the United States? Is China, in effect, a giant Japan? Most Americans think so. Bookstores are filled with titles such as When China Rules the World and Becoming China's Bitch, and opinion polls show that most Americans believe China is already the world's dominant economic power. As I show in a recent article in International Security, however, this view is a dangerous delusion held in the face of significant evidence to the contrary. For many reasons, China is unlikely to repeat Japan's success. Most important, China is developing in a far more challenging international environment than Japan faced in the second half of the 20th century. As a result, its economy will remain more compatible than competitive with America's for the foreseeable future.

#### US will overtake Chinese competitive advantage.

Harold L. Sirkin et al, senior partner and managing director in the Chicago office of The Boston

Consulting Group, August 2011, “Made in America, Again,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/64261145/BCG-Made-in-America-Again

Our analysis concludes that, within ﬁve years, the total cost of production for many products will be only about 10 to 15 percent less in Chinese coastal cities than in some parts of the U.S. where factories are likely to be built. Factor in shipping, inventory costs, and other considerations, and—for many goods destined for the North American market—the cost gap between sourcing in China and manufacturing in the U.S. will be minimal. In some cases, companies will move work to inland China to ﬁnd lower wages. But this will not be an attractive option in many industries. Chinese cities in the interior provinces lack the abundance of skilled workers, supply networks, and efficient transportation infrastructure of those along the coast, offsetting much of the savings afforded by slightly lower labor costs.

### No Solvency – Alternative Causes

#### Can’t solve competitiveness – structural political problems.

Niall Ferguson, Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History, Harvard University, 3/28/2012, “Is the US Losing Competitiveness?” Testimony for the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee, http://appropriations.house.gov/UploadedFiles/03.28.12\_CJS\_-\_American\_Manufacturing\_and\_Job\_Repatriation\_-\_Niall\_Ferguson\_-\_Testimony.pdf

The nation’s capital may be a competitive city by the EIU’s criteria. But, to judge by the evidence presented here, Washington seems to be intent on rendering the rest of America uncompetitive in a highly troubling way. All discussions of declining U.S. competitiveness need to focus on a hitherto largely overlooked phenomenon: a measurable degeneration in the quality of this country’s institutional framework. When executives complain about the effectiveness of [the] political system, the defects of K-12 education system, the complexity of the tax code, the inconsistency of macroeconomic policy, the burdens of regulation, and the inefficiency of [the] legal framework, they are not fantasizing or passing the buck. They are identifying real problems. In some respects, I might go so far as to call it the problem of “Soviet America”. The United States was victorious in the Cold War. Yet, imperceptibly, certain traits we used to associate with the Communist enemy have been creeping into American life. Over-mighty bureaucracy, excessive regulation, a sham rule of law, corruption: these are dangerous tendencies, and economic stagnation is only one of their likely consequences. Other consequences we might expect include political decadence and geopolitical decline. At the very least, we are seeing here the emergence of a more European America – though European in the sense of Italy, not Germany.

#### Bureaucratic education system destroys long-term competitiveness.

Craig R. Barrett, Former CEO and Chairman, Intel Corporation, 9/12/2011, “Education Reform and U.S. Competitiveness,” http://www.cfr.org/education/education-reform-us-competitiveness/p25816

To compete in the twenty-first century, individuals and countries will have to add value in the workplace to command a high standard of living and be competitive in the global marketplace. Education is the key to adding value. The United States recognizes that its K-12 education is not doing the job. You need good teachers with content expertise, high expectations, and feedback systems to help struggling students and teachers. These three requirements are difficult to implement in a massive public education system designed more for working adults than for learning students.

#### Tax code is the key internal link to collapsing competitivness.

Al Cardenas, chairman of the American Conservative Union, 11/8/2011, “The Chief Threat to American Competitiveness: Our Tax Code,” National Review, http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/282557/chief-threat-american-competitiveness-our-tax-code-al-cardenas#

More than three years after America’s financial system hit a crisis point, the state of our economy remains in turmoil. As our nation’s leaders grapple with immediate challenges through dueling jobs plans and the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction tries to come to agreement on a trillion and a half in reductions, we must also consider long-term measures to strengthen our economic security. As it stands now, the number one threat to the future of American competitiveness isn’t other countries. It’s our tax law. The United States Tax Code is difficult to understand and even harder to navigate, for families and businesses alike. Title 26 has been patchworked, reformed, and tinkered with for decades, giving us an antiquated mess of laws rife with inequities. Our corporate tax rate is among the highest in the world. We refuse to shift to a Territorial Tax System that would stop punishing our companies for bringing earned overseas income back to the U.S. for reinvestment. Tax rates for small businesses remain high and inconsistent.

### No Impact – Competitiveness Resilient

#### US competitiveness resilient – history proves.

Harold L. Sirkin and Michael Zinser, senior partner at The Boston Consulting Group and Michael Zinser and partner who leads the firm's manufacturing work in the Americas, 3/6/2012, “New Math Will Drive a U.S. Manufacturing Comeback,” http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2012/03/new\_math\_will\_drive\_a\_us\_manuf.html

As we all know, U.S. manufacturing has faced many threats in the past. "Japan Inc." was going to close down U.S. factories in the 1970s. Then came the Asian Tigers: Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. Now it's Brazil, China and India. Each time, U.S. manufacturing took a hard blow, adjusted, and recovered. So today, some 40 years after the Japanese challenge first emerged, U.S. factories are producing two-and-a-half times more than they did in 1972, in terms of manufacturing value added, with 30% less total labor. The China challenge could play out the same way. While China is much larger and a bigger threat, its wages are rising 15-20 percent per year and its domestic demand for consumer goods is growing rapidly.

#### Competitiveness resilient – history and current metrics prove.

Daniel Gross, columnist and economics editor for Yahoo! Finance, 5/10/2012, “The Myth of American Decline,” HBR Ideacast interview, http://blogs.hbr.org/ideacast/2012/05/the-myth-of-american-decline.html

JUSTIN FOX: So why are we being deluged by so many predictions of doom and urgent prescriptions for improvement? Like, for example, HBR's March issue on restoring US competitiveness. DANIEL GROSS: Well, I think we have a very procyclical economy, and we have a very procyclical market for ideas. When everybody's going in one direction, everybody piles on. So you get this stuff about how great private equity and real estate is in '06 and how great technology was in 1999. And the flip side is when you took a fall like the one we took. We had an economy shrinking at a 6% annual rate, which is something we haven't seen in 80 years. We had the deepest recession we've had in 80 years. The contraction in car sales, in housing, no one had witnessed this in their lifetime. And so when this comes on you very quickly, it's very easy for people to say, well, how are we gonna get out of this? What are we all going to do for jobs if we're not going to work in real estate or structured finance? How are we going to pay down these debts? And I think the reality is that we've been at these junctures many times in the past. '30s, '50s when we were concerned about Sputnik. In the '70s when we had double-digit inflation and runaway oil costs. And we have proved, as an economy, quite adaptable and resilient. We figure out new ways of doing things.

#### Manufacturing strength proves resiliency.

Arvind Kaushal, Thomas Mayor and Patricia Riedl, partner, senior executive advisor and principal with Booz & Company, Autumn 2011, “Manufacturing’s Wake-up Call,” Strategy+Business, http://www.strategy-business.com/media/file/sb64\_11306.pdf

Still, the data shows clearly that U.S. manufacturing as a whole has great potential to rebound. When considered sector by sector, many U.S. companies can and should be the supplier of choice for the vast majority of goods sold in North America – and some can still be a primary source of production for global markets. This resilience was evident in the survey of manufacturing professionals; more than 65 percent of respondents said that it was unlikely they would stop investing in new U.S. manufacturing assets and technologies by 2025. Many of them are shifting manufacturing activities back to North America from Asia and other off-shore locations.

### No Impact – Economy

#### Competitiveness not key to the economy.

Paul Krugman, professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University, 1/23/2011, “The Competition Myth,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/24/opinion/24krugman.html?\_r=2

But let’s not kid ourselves: talking about “competitiveness” as a goal is fundamentally misleading. At best, it’s a misdiagnosis of our problems. At worst, it could lead to policies based on the false idea that what’s good for corporations is good for America. About that misdiagnosis: What sense does it make to view our current woes as stemming from lack of competitiveness? It’s true that we’d have more jobs if we exported more and imported less. But the same is true of Europe and Japan, which also have depressed economies. And we can’t all export more while importing less, unless we can find another planet to sell to. Yes, we could demand that China shrink its trade surplus — but if confronting China is what Mr. Obama is proposing, he should say that plainly. Furthermore, while America is running a trade deficit, this deficit is smaller than it was before the Great Recession began. It would help if we could make it smaller still. But ultimately, we’re in a mess because we had a financial crisis, not because American companies have lost their ability to compete with foreign rivals.

#### Competitiveness not key to growth – their evidence misunderstands economic theory.

Paul Krugman, professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University, March/April 1994, “Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.pkarchive.org/global/pop.html

Unfortunately, his diagnosis was deeply misleading as a guide to what ails Europe, and similar diagnoses in the United States are equally misleading. The idea that a country's economic fortunes are largely determined by its success on world markets is a hypothesis, not a necessary truth; and as a practical, empirical matter, that hypothesis is flatly wrong. That is, it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets. The growing obsession in most advanced nations with international competitiveness should be seen, not as a well-founded concern, but as a view held in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. And yet it is clearly a view that people very much want to hold -- a desire to believe that is reflected in a remarkable tendency of those who preach the doctrine of competitiveness to support their case with careless, flawed arithmetic.

#### Focus on competitiveness won’t boost the US economy.

Paul Krugman, professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University, 1/23/2011, “The Competition Myth,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/24/opinion/24krugman.html?\_r=2

So what does the administration’s embrace of the rhetoric of competitiveness mean for economic policy? The favorable interpretation, as I said, is that it’s just packaging for an economic strategy centered on public investment, investment that’s actually about creating jobs now while promoting longer-term growth. The unfavorable interpretation is that Mr. Obama and his advisers really believe that the economy is ailing because they’ve been too tough on business, and that what America needs now is corporate tax cuts and across-the-board deregulation. My guess is that we’re mainly talking about packaging here. And if the president does propose a serious increase in spending on infrastructure and education, I’ll be pleased. But even if he proposes good policies, the fact that Mr. Obama feels the need to wrap these policies in bad metaphors is a sad commentary on the state of our discourse. The financial crisis of 2008 was a teachable moment, an object lesson in what can go wrong if you trust a market economy to regulate itself. Nor should we forget that highly regulated economies, like Germany, did a much better job than we did at sustaining employment after the crisis hit. For whatever reason, however, the teachable moment came and went with nothing learned.

### No Impact – Heg

#### Competitiveness not key to heg

Robert E. Pape, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, January-February 2009, “Empire Falls,” The National Interest, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_99/ai\_n32148803/pg\_6/

And of course America needs to develop a plan to reinvigorate the competitiveness of its economy. Recently, Harvard's Michael Porter issued an economic blueprint to renew America's environment for innovation. The heart of his plan is to remove the obstacles to increasing investment in science and technology. A combination of targeted tax, fiscal and education policies to stimulate more productive investment over the long haul is a sensible domestic component to America's new grand strategy. But it would be misguided to assume that the United States could easily regain its previously dominant economic position, since the world will likely remain globally competitive. To justify postponing this restructuring of its grand strategy, America would need a firm expectation of high rates of economic growth over the next several years. There is no sign of such a burst on the horizon. Misguided efforts to extract more security from a declining economic base only divert potential resources from investment in the economy, trapping the state in an ever-worsening strategic dilemma. This approach has done little for great powers in the past, and America will likely be no exception when it comes to the inevitable costs of desperate policy making.

#### Military superiority key to heg – no one can challenge the US.

Barry R. Posen, Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Summer 2003 “Command of the Commons,” International Security, http://web.mit.edu/ssp/people/posen/commandofthecommons.pdf

One pillar of U.S. hegemony is the vast military power of the United States. A staple of the U.S. debate about the size of the post–Cold War defense budget is the observation that the United States spends more than virtually all of the world’s other major military powers combined, most of which are U.S. allies. Observers of the actual capabilities that this effort produces can focus on a favorite aspect of U.S. superiority to make the point that the United States sits comfortably atop the military food chain, and is likely to remain there. This article takes a slightly different approach. Below I argue that the United States enjoys command of the commons—command of the sea, space, and air. I discuss how command of the commons supports a hegemonic grand strategy. I explain why it seems implausible that a challenge to this command could arise in the near to medium term. Then I review the arenas of military action where adversaries continue to be able to fight U.S. forces with some hope of success— the “contested zones.” I argue that in the near to medium term the United States will not be able to establish command in these arenas. The interrelationship between U.S. command of the commons and the persistence of the contested zones suggests that the United States can probably pursue a policy of selective engagement but not one of primacy.

#### Competitiveness not key – US military too far ahead.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution1/11/2012, “Not Fade Away,” The New Republic, http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?page=0,1&passthru=ZDkyNzQzZTk3YWY3YzE0OWM5MGRiZmIwNGQwNDBiZmI&utm\_source=Editors%20and%20Bloggers&utm\_campaign=cbaee91d9d-Edit\_and\_Blogs&utm\_medium=email

Military capacity matters, too, as early nineteenth-century China learned and Chinese leaders know today. As Yan Xuetong recently noted, “military strength underpins hegemony.” Here the United States remains unmatched. It is far and away the most powerful nation the world has ever known, and there has been no decline in America’s relative military capacity—at least not yet. Americans currently spend less than $600 billion a year on defense, more than the rest of the other great powers combined. (This figure does not include the deployment in Iraq, which is ending, or the combat forces in Afghanistan, which are likely to diminish steadily over the next couple of years.) They do so, moreover, while consuming a little less than 4 percent of GDP annually—a higher percentage than the other great powers, but in historical terms lower than the 10 percent of GDP that the United States spent on defense in the mid-1950s and the 7 percent it spent in the late 1980s. The superior expenditures underestimate America’s actual superiority in military capability. American land and air forces are equipped with the most advanced weaponry, and are the most experienced in actual combat. They would defeat any competitor in a head-to-head battle. American naval power remains predominant in every region of the world.

### No I/L – Decoupling

#### No global collapse – other economies have decoupled.

Peter Passell, senior fellow at the Milken Institute, 4/4/2012, “Decoupling: Ties That No Longer Bind,” Foreign Policy blog, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/03/ties\_that\_no\_longer\_bind

Everybody knows that the global economy is becoming more tightly integrated -- that factors ranging from the collapse of ocean shipping costs, to the rise of multinational manufacturing, to the growth of truly international securities markets, have bound national economies to each other as never before. This, of course, must mean we're now all in it together. Booms and busts in rich countries will reverberate ever more strongly through developing and emerging market economies. Right? Sounds reasonable, but that's not what's happened. The big emerging market economies (notably, China, India and Brazil) took only modest hits from the housing finance bubble and subsequent recession in the U.S., Japan and Europe, then went back to growth-as-usual. Hence the paradox: Emerging-market and developing countries have somehow "decoupled" from the Western business cycle in an era of ever-increasing economic integration. But the experts have yet to agree on why. Here are the two contending explanations:

#### Other countries will maintain growth despite US decline – diversification and proactive policymaking.

Peter Passell, senior fellow at the Milken Institute, 4/4/2012, “Decoupling: Ties That No Longer Bind,” Foreign Policy blog, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/03/ties\_that\_no\_longer\_bind

There is no real need to choose between these explanations. By virtue of their size and diversification, emerging market economies have now more influence on the economic fortunes of other emerging-market and developing economies. And by virtue of their improving track records as credible inflation-fighters, they have more capacity to use fiscal and monetary stimulus to stay ahead of global recessions. This is surely good news. But it does leave a big unanswered question. The big emerging market countries are acquiring the will and the way to protect their own interests during global economic crises. We don't know, though, whether they will have sufficiently broad perspective to step up to leadership roles in managing global crises as their

economic power converges with that of the rich industrial countries.

#### Developing countries can survive downturns in the US – empirical proof.

Cris Heaton, contributor to MoneyWeek, 1/6/2012, “The truth about emerging market 'decoupling',” MoneyWeek, http://www.moneyweek.com/investments/stock-markets/emerging-markets/moneyweek-asia-emerging-equities-or-us-treasuries-20100

That's significant, because emerging economies are often seen as being entirely geared to growth in the developed world. When the US and Europe are doing well, emerging markets do even better. When they falter, emerging markets fall harder. That's certainly true of some emerging economies. If you're a small, trade-dependent economy, you will outperform to the upside and to the downside. But it didn't hold true for the emerging world as a whole. Large, more domestically driven economies such as China, India, Indonesia and (to a lesser extent) the Philippines held up much better. There is a substantial bloc of economies within the emerging world that have their own momentum and aren't solely dependent on what happens in the developed world, even though they are still affected by it. A decade or so ago, this wasn't so true; the emerging economies that investors cared about then were mostly smaller and more export-centred.

### No Impact – Economy Resilient

#### US economy is resilient – innovation and open government.

Ian Bremmer, president of Eurasia Group,July/August 2011, “On the Economy, Be Careful What You Wish For,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/20/on\_the\_economy\_be\_careful\_what\_you\_wish\_for?page=0,2

Some might argue that the impact of the relative decline of the U.S. economy has already been felt and that a weaker dollar will ultimately make American products more competitive abroad. FP's survey results seem to reflect this optimistic view, though the vast majority of those surveyed are clamoring for rebalancing, with all its pitfalls and dangers. There is no reason to doubt, moreover, the long-term resilience of America's political and economic systems. Democracy offers a degree of domestic political legitimacy that cannot be earned in any other way. America's achievements in higher education and innovation are, and will remain, the envy of much of the rest of the world. But rebalancing will upend lots of assumptions, in the United States and around the world, about American economic resilience and its importance for other countries. This transition is not a product of poor decisions or myopic political leadership -- though leaders of both parties in Washington have offered plenty of both in recent years. This is a structural shift, one that has been decades in the making. Resistance is futile. Adapting to its impact can help Americans, and everyone else, thrive in the era to come.

#### US economy can withstand shocks – empirically proven.

Bloomberg, 5/9/2012, “Fed’s Plosser Says U.S. Economy Proving Resilient to Shocks,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-09/fed-s-plosser-says-u-s-economy-proving-resilient-to-shocks.html

Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank President Charles Plosser said the U.S. economy has proven “remarkably resilient” to shocks that can damage growth, including surging oil prices and natural disasters. “The economy has now grown for 11 consecutive quarters,” Plosser said today according to remarks prepared for a speech at the Philadelphia Fed. “Growth is not robust. But growth in the past year has continued despite significant risks and external and internal headwinds.” Plosser, who did not discuss his economic outlook or the future for monetary policy, cited shocks to the economy last year, including the tsunami in Japan that disrupted global supply chains, Europe’s credit crisis that has damaged the continent’s banking system and political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa. “The U.S. economy has a history of being remarkably resilient,” said Plosser, who doesn’t have a vote on policy this year. “These shocks held GDP growth to less than 1 percent in the first half of 2011, and many analysts were concerned that the economy was heading toward a double dip. Yet, the economy proved resilient and growth picked up in the second half of the year.”

#### New regulations check decline – US economy resilient.

Greg Robb, MarketWatch Pulse, 5/15/2012, “Geithner: U.S. Economy Improving, More Resilient,” Fox Business, http://www.foxbusiness.com/markets/2012/05/15/geithner-us-economy-improving-more-resilient/

Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner on Tuesday said the U.S. economy is gradually getting stronger, with areas of strength broadening. "We are doing a lot of the really tough work you need to...dig our way out of the mess that caused the crisis and I think growth now looks more broad-based and resilient," Geithner said at a conference sponsored by the Peter G. Peterson Foundation. Geithner said J.P. Morgan's $2 billion trading loss was a failure of risk management. He said it made a "very powerful case for financial reform - the reforms we have ahead and the reforms we have already put in place." Geithner said he has not talked to Jamie Dimon since the J.P. Morgan Chase & Co's CEO announced the loss late last week. The test of financial reform is to make sure bank mistakes don't put the economy at risk, Geithner said. "We are going to work very hard to ensure that these reforms are tough and effective - not just the Volcker rule - but the broader complement of reforms on capital and liquidity and derivatives markets," he said.

### No impact – Conflict

#### Recession proves that economic slowdown doesn’t cause war.

Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, 8/24/2009, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape.

#### No diversionary war – risks of lash-out via conflict are too high.

Charles R. Boehmer, Associate Professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, Texas, June 2010, “Economic growth and violent international conflict: 1875-1999,” Defence and Peace Economics, p.265

The results also show that theories from the Crisis-Scarcity perspective lack explanatory power linking GDP growth rates to war at the state level of analysis. This is not to say that such theories completely lack explanatory power in general, but more particularly that they cannot directly link economic growth rates to state behavior in violent interstate conflicts. In contrast, theories of diversionary conflict may well hold some explanatory power, although not regarding GDP growth in a general test of states from all regions of the world across time. Perhaps diversionary theory better explains state behaviors short of war, where the costs of externalizing domestic tensions do not become too costly, or in relation to the foreign policies of particular countries. In many circumstances, engaging in a war to divert attention away from domestic conditions would seemingly exacerbate domestic crisis conditions unless the chances of victory were practically assured. Nonetheless, this study does show that domestic conflict is associated with interstate conflict. If diversionary conflict theory has any traction as an economic explanation of violent interstate conflicts, it may require the study of other explanatory variables besides overall GDP growth rates, such as unemployment or inflation rates.

#### Studies prove – economic decline doesn’t cause war.

Charles R. Boehmer, Associate Professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, Texas, June 2010, “Economic growth and violent international conflict: 1875-1999,” Defence and Peace Economics, p.261

The military expenditure growth variable is also insignificant. However, this variable is significant if expenditure growth is measured with either a one-year lag or a ten-year moving average (not reported in Table I). Hence, there is some evidence that states with growing military expenditures are more prone to initiate militarized disputes, in support of Hypothesis 5, although this finding is not robust across different time measurements of expenditure growth. As we would also expect, major powers and states with many neighbors are more likely to initiate militarized disputes than minor powers or states with fewer neighbors (measured with Borders). Both variables are positive and highly significant. There is some evidence here for the proposition that domestic unrest leads states to initiate militarized disputes, which is in part congruent with diversionary conflict theories. Protest is positive and highly significant whereas Rebellion is also positive but weakly significant. However, there is no evidence here to support the argument provided by the crisis-scarcity perspective that lower economic growth rates directly lead states to initiate interstate conflicts. Economic development does not appear to affect MID initiation but institutional constraints on executives decreases this likelihood. There is indeed also some serial autocorrelation captured by the Peace Years and spline variables (not reported in Table I) in the MID Initiation model; states that have more recently initiated a MID are more likely to do so again in the future.

### No impact – China

#### US crisis won’t tank Chinese economy – they’ve taken steps to decouple.

Ian Bremmer, president of Eurasia Group, July/August 2010, “Gathering Storm: America and China in 2020,” World Affairs,” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/gathering-storm-america-and-china-2020

Put bluntly, China’s leaders no longer believe that American power is indispensable for their country’s prosperity—or their own long-term political survival. The financial crisis has underlined the risk that China has accepted in relying on exports to developed states for economic growth. This has increased the urgency with which the leadership works to build domestic demand for Chinese products. Chinese officials have made news in recent months with the occasional call for the establishment of a new reserve currency to replace the dollar. That cannot happen overnight, but as China reduces its dependence on market conditions in the West, the need to purchase dollars will gradually ease, and much of the reserves will flow toward the purchase of commodities. This is a long-term project and one that will have to be undertaken carefully to ensure that the creative destruction that accompanies this transition does not force so many people out of work at one time that widespread social unrest reaches critical mass.

#### No impact even if Chinese economy declines – government can compensate for free market.

Ian Bremmer, president of Eurasia Group, July/August 2010, “Gathering Storm: America and China in 2020,” World Affairs,” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/gathering-storm-america-and-china-2020

The financial crisis and global recession have given that model a new sheen—and shifted the balance of power in U.S.-Chinese relations. The international market meltdown hit China only indirectly, but had a dramatic impact nonetheless. Its banks were not exposed to the contagion as much as Western financial institutions were, but a loss of purchasing power in America, Europe, and Japan sharply reduced demand for Chinese products, led to enormous overproduction in China, and temporarily cost millions of Chinese their jobs. Beijing moved quickly to stop the bleeding with a massive stimulus package, directing hundreds of billions of dollars through state-controlled lenders to state-owned companies for use on large-scale, job-creating infrastructure products. The robust recovery that followed has further persuaded the leadership that state capitalism heals the wounds inflicted by under-regulated free markets.

#### No risk of their collapse impact

Sofia Wu, Central News Agency, 9/3/2010, “Difficult for China to turn to democracy,” Focus Taiwan, http://focustaiwan.tw/ShowNews/WebNews\_Detail.aspx?ID=201009030013&Type=aOPN

(Sofia-, Central News Agency – Taiwan: Apple Daily, “Difficult for China to turn to democracy”, Lexis)

Several factors, however, might prevent China's communist regime from an abrupt downfall like those in the Soviet Union and other East European countries. First, entrenched interest groups and the social elite in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe believed the collapse of their communist regimes would better benefit them, whereas China's elite are convinced that communist rule is in their best interests. Second, liberalism is rooted in Eastern European tradition and the people there had long been fed up with Soviet totalitarianism. China on the other hand has never had a liberal tradition and is accustomed to despotic rule. Third, China's economic system has long been transformed from a centralized planning model to a capitalistic one, unlike those that were in place in Eastern Europe under communism. Last but not least, China already describes its political system "democratic, with special Chinese characteristics" and considers that the legitimacy of communist rule is beyond question.

### No impact – Radicalism/Authoritarianism

#### Recession proves – decline doesn’t cause conflict.

Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, 8/24/2009, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis

Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces.

#### Crisis doesn’t cause radical governments – recession proves.

Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, 8/24/2009, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis

Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed.

#### No increase in Islamic radicalism.

Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, 8/24/2009, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis

Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism.

### Uniqueness – Heg High Now

#### US hegemony strong – studies prove.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

Second, many studies are static, presenting single-year snapshots of U.S. and Chinese power. This flaw tends to bias results in favor of the alternative perspective because the United States retains a significant lead in most categories. The key question, however, is not whether the United States is more powerful than China at present, but whether it will remain so in the future. Without a dynamic analysis, it is impossible to answer this question. This study addresses these shortcomings by comparing the United States and China across a large set of economic, technological, and military indicators over the past twenty years. The results are mixed, but the bulk of the evidence supports the alternative perspective. Over the last two decades, globalization and U.S. hegemonic burdens have expanded significantly, yet the United States has not declined; in fact it is now wealthier, more innovative, and more militarily powerful compared to China than it was in 1991.

#### Declinists are wrong – no data to back up their claims.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

With few exceptions, however, existing studies on the decline of the United States and the rise of China suffer from at least one of the following shortcomings. First, most studies do not look at a comprehensive set of indicators. Instead they paint impressionistic pictures of the balance of power, presenting tidbits of information on a handful of metrics. In general, this approach biases results in favor of the declinist perspective because most standard indicators of national power—for example, gross domestic product (GDP), population, and energy consumption—conflate size with power and thereby overstate the capabilities of large but underdeveloped countries. For example, in a recent study Arvind Subramanian contends that “China’s dominance is a sure thing” based on “an index of dominance combining just three factors: a country’s GDP, its trade (measured as the sum of its exports and imports of goods), and the extent to which it is a net creditor to the world.” The United States and China, however, are each declining by some measures while rising in terms of others. To distinguish between ascendance and decline writ large, therefore, requires analyzing many indicators and determining how much each one matters in relation to others.

#### No collapse of unipolarity – change in economics hasn’t shifted balance of power.

William Wohlforth, Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, March 2012, “How Not to Evaluate Theories,” International Studies Quarterly, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00708.x/full

“This Time It’s Real” does not even begin to make that case. Missing is any argument for how a 3% decline in the US share of global GDP amounts to a polarity shift according to Layne’s own definitions (according to IMF, World Bank, and UN estimates, over a 1993–2010 interval, the United States has declined from 26% to 23% of global GDP in nominal terms, and from 23% to just under 20% in PPP terms.) If Layne has some new definition that is consistent with this proclamation, it is incumbent upon him to state it. Otherwise, it is hard to see how this new claim can advance scholarship. The same goes for predictions about the imminent demise of US “hegemony” and the “Pax Americana.” Without clearer definitions of these things, there will be no way to evaluate these predictions empirically, which brings us to the third problem.

### No Solvency – Decline Inevitable

#### Hegemonic decline inevitable – structural reasons.

Christopher Layne, Professor in National Security at Texas A & M University’s George H. W. Bush School of Government and Public Service, 4/25/2012, “The Global Power Shift from West to East,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/profile/christopher-layne

But even during the Cold War's last two decades, the seeds of American decline had already been sown. In a prescient - but premature - analysis, President Richard Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger believed that the bipolar Cold War system would give way to a pentagonal multipolar system composed of die United States, Soviet Union, Europe, China and Japan. Nixon also confronted America's declining international financial power in 1971 when he took the dollar off the Bretton Woods gold standard in response to currency pressures. Later, in 1987, Yale's Paul Kennedy published his brilliant Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, which raised questions about the structural, fiscal and economic weaknesses in America that, over time, could nibble away at the foundations of U.S. power. With America's subsequent Cold War triumph - and the bursting of Japan's economic bubble - Kennedy's thesis was widely dismissed. Now, in the wake of the 2008 financial meltdown and ensuing recession, it is clear that Kennedy and other "declinists" were right all along. The same causes of decline they pointed to are at the center of today's debate about America's economic prospects: too much consumption and not enough savings; persistent trade and currentaccount deficits; deindustrialization; sluggish economic growth; and chronic federal-budget deficits fueling an ominously rising national debt.

#### US can’t perpetuate hegemony – polarity has already shifted.

Christopher Layne, professor and Chair in Intelligence and National Security at Texas A&M University, March 2012, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana,” International Studies Quarterly, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00704.x/full

In the Great Recession’s aftermath, it is apparent that much has changed since 2007. Predictions of continuing unipolarity have been superseded by premonitions of American decline and geopolitical transformation. The Great Recession has had a twofold impact. First, it highlighted the shift of global wealth—and power—from West to East, a trend illustrated by China’s breathtakingly rapid rise to great-power status. Second, it has raised doubts about the robustness of the economic and financial underpinnings of the United States’ primacy. In this article, I argue that the “unipolar moment” is over, and the Pax Americana—the era of American ascendancy in international politics that began in 1945—is fast winding down. I challenge the conventional wisdom among International Relations/security studies scholars on three counts. First, I show that, contrary to the claims of unipolar stability theorists, the distribution of power in the international system no longer is unipolar. Second, I revisit the 1980s’ debate about American decline and demonstrate that the Great Recession has vindicated the so-called declinists of that decade. Finally, I take on the “institutional lock-in” argument, which holds that by strengthening the Pax Americana’s legacy institutions, the United States can perpetuate the essential elements of the international order it constructed following World War II even as the material foundations of American primacy erode.

### No Solvency – Decline Inevitable

#### US can’t save hegemony – geopolitical power already shifting – US must accept decline.

Christopher Layne, professor and Chair in Intelligence and National Security at Texas A&M University, March 2012, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana,” International Studies Quarterly, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00704.x/full

The distribution of power in international political system is shifting dramatically. The US grand strategy must respond to the emerging constellation of power. Yet, US policymakers and many security studies scholars are in thrall to a peculiar form of denialism. First, they believe the world still is unipolar even in the face of overwhelming evidence that it is not. Second, they believe that even if unipolarity were to end, there would be no real consequences for the United States because it will still be the “pivotal” power in international politics, and the essential features of the “liberal order”—the Pax Americana—will remain in place even though no longer buttressed by the US economic and military power that have undergirded it since its inception after World War II. This is myopic. Hegemonic decline always has consequences. As the twenty-first century’s second decade begins, history and multipolarity are staging a comeback. The world figures to become a much more turbulent place geopolitically than it was during the era of the Pax Americana. Accepting the reality of the Unipolar Exit—coming to grips with its own decline and the end of unipolarity symbolized by China’s rise—will be the United States’ central grand strategic preoccupation during the next ten to fifteen years.

### No Impact – Hegemony Resilient

#### Heg is resilient – no shot of decline.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

Change is inevitable, but it is often incremental and nonlinear. In the coming decades, China may surge out of its unimpressive condition and close the gap with the United States. Or China might continue to rise in place—steadily improving its capabilities in absolute terms while stagnating, or even declining, relative to the United States. At the time of this writing, the United States remains mired in the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression and carries the largest debt in its history. Moreover, the recent partisan standoff over raising the debt ceiling suggests the American political system is losing the capacity for compromise on basic issues, let alone on large-scale problems. It is impossible to say whether the current malaise is the beginning of the end of the unipolar era or simply an aberration. The best that can be done is to make plans for the future on the basis of long-term trends; and the trends suggest that the United States’ economic, technological, and military lead over China will be an enduring feature of international relations, not a passing moment in time, but a deeply embedded condition that will persist well into this century.

#### Hegemonic crises are overhyped – US leadership always bounces back.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 1/11/2012, “Not Fade Away,” The New Republic, http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?page=0,1&passthru=ZDkyNzQzZTk3YWY3YzE0OWM5MGRiZmIwNGQwNDBiZmI&utm\_source=Editors%20and%20Bloggers&utm\_campaign=cbaee91d9d-Edit\_and\_Blogs&utm\_medium=email

Success in the past does not guarantee success in the future. But one thing does seem clear from the historical evidence: the American system, for all its often stultifying qualities, has also shown a greater capacity to adapt and recover from difficulties than many other nations, including its geopolitical competitors. This undoubtedly has something to do with the relative freedom of American society, which rewards innovators, often outside the existing power structure, for producing new ways of doing things; and with the relatively open political system of America, which allows movements to gain steam and to influence the behavior of the political establishment. The American system is slow and clunky in part because the Founders designed it that way, with a federal structure, checks and balances, and a written Constitution and Bill of Rights—but the system also possesses a remarkable ability to undertake changes just when the steam kettle looks about to blow its lid. There are occasional “critical elections” that allow transformations to occur, providing new political solutions to old and apparently insoluble problems. Of course, there are no guarantees: the political system could not resolve the problem of slavery without war. But on many big issues throughout their history, Americans have found a way of achieving and implementing a national consensus.

#### Problems with hegemony are self-correcting – empirically proven.

Daniel W. Drezner, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, 1/27/2012, “Is American influence really on the wane?” Foreign Policy, http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/27/is\_american\_influence\_really\_on\_the\_wane

It seems that Walt's primary concern is that without better domestic policies, the United States might fritter away its great power advantages. I'm sympathetic to that argument -- I'd also take the bold position that I'd like to see improvements in American education and infrastructure as well. One of the points I was making in my original post, however was that even absent grand initiatives from Washington, the United States economy was finding ways to heal itself. Indeed, compared to either Europe or China, one could argue that the United States has adjusted to the post-2008 environment the best. This is not so much praise for Washington as an indictment of rigidities in Brussels and Beijing. Still, power and influence are relative measures, and I see little evidence to support Walt's pessimism.

### No Impact – Hegemony Not Key to Solve

#### Hegemony not key to their impacts – current order will outlive US hegemony.

John Ikenberry, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, 10/16/2011, “Ikenberry's turn,” Foreign Policy blog, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/10/16/ikenberrys\_turn

I go on to argue that this hegemonic order is in crisis. Importantly, it is not liberal internationalism -- as a logic of order -- that is in crisis. It is America's hegemonic role that is in trouble. There is a global struggle underway over the distribution of rights, privileges, authority, etc. I argue that this is a "crisis of success" in that it is the rise of non-Western developing states and the ongoing intensification of economic and security interdependence that have triggered the crisis and overrun the governance institutions of the old order. This is a bit like Samuel Huntington's famous "development gap" -- a situation in which rapidly mobilizing and expanding social forces and economic transformation, facilitated by the old political institutions, have outpaced and overrun those institutions. That is what has happened to American hegemony. The book ends by asking: what comes next? And I argue that the constituencies for open, rules-based order are expanding, not contracting. The world system may become "less American," but it will not become "less liberal." So that is my argument.

#### Hegemony fails – their impact authors ignore the forms of resistance that prevent effective deployment.

Charles F. Doran, Professor of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University, 2009, “Fooling Oneself: The Mythology of Hegemony,” International Studies Review, p.178

Yet, led by a groundswell of neo-conservative foreign policy thought (Krauthamer 1991; Mastanduno 1997; Wohlforth 1999; Kagan 2002; Barnett 2004), intellectual elites have so committed themselves to the hegemonic thesis that they have blinded themselves to the consequences of their own speculation. Should they be surprised when the ‘‘hierarchy’’ of international relations turns out to be non-existent, or the capacity to control even very weak and divided polities is met with frustration? Americans have invented a mythology of hegemonic domination that corresponds so poorly to the position they actually find themselves in that they cannot comprehend the responses of other governments to their actions. Bobrow and his fellow writers show the dozens of ways that other governments find to evade, and to subvert, the proscriptions and fulminations emanating from Washington. By creating a mythology of hegemony rather than learning to work with the (properly conceived) balance of power, the United States has complicated its foreign policy and vastly raised the costs of its operation (Brown et al. 2000; Brzezinski 2004). By destroying a secular, albeit brutal, Sunni Arab center of power in Iraq, the United States must now contend with a far greater problem (Fearon 2006) of itself having to hold the country together and to balance a resurgent Iran. Bogged down in Iraq, it is unable to deter aggression against allies elsewhere such as Georgia and the Ukraine, or to stop the growing Russian penetration of Latin America. By waving the flag of hegemony, the United States finds that very few other governments see the need to assist it, because hegemony is supposed to be self-financing, self-enforcing, and self-sufficient.

#### Hegemony doesn’t cause a net decrease in conflict – ongoing wars prove.

Daniel Larison, Ph.D. graduate from the University of Chicago and contributing Editor, 4/5/2010, “A Bright Post-Hegemonic Future,” The American Conservative, http://www.amconmag.com/larison/2010/04/05/a-bright-post-hegemonic-future/

In other words, unsustainable U.S. hegemony will not be as great as it was, and that will mean that other major and rising powers will be able to exert something more like the normal influence in their regions that such powers have exerted throughout most of modern history. Will there be conflicts in such a world? Of course, there will be, but we already have a number of conflicts in the world that have either been deemed irrelevant to the maintenance of Pax Americana or they are the products of policies designed to perpetuate Pax Americana. In practice, securing this “peace” has involved starting several wars, the largest and most destructive of which has been the war in Iraq, as well as supporting proxies and allies as they escalated conflicts with their neighbors.

### Impact Turn – China

#### Attempting to sustain US hegemony causes war with China.

Christopher Layne, Professor in National Security at Texas A & M University’s George H. W. Bush School of Government and Public Service, 4/25/2012, “The Global Power Shift from West to East,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/profile/christopher-layne

Certainly, the Chinese have not forgotten. Now Beijing aims to dominate its own East and Southeast Asian backyard, just as a rising America sought to dominate the Western Hemisphere a century and a half ago. The United States and China now are competing for supremacy in East and Southeast Asia. Washington has been the incumbent hegemon there since World War H, and many in the American foreignpolicy establishment view China's quest for regional hegemony as a threat that must be resisted. This contest for regional dominance is fueling escalating tensions and possibly could lead to war. In geopolitics, two great powers cannot simultaneously be hegemonic in the same region. Unless one of them abandons its aspirations, there is a high probability of hostilities. Flashpoints that could spark a Sino-American conflict include the unstable Korean Peninsula; the disputed status of Taiwan; competition for control of oil and other natural resources; and the burgeoning naval rivalry between the two powers.

#### Hegemony tanks US-China relations.

Global Times, 6/9/2009, “Yellow Sea no place for US carrier,” http://opinion.globaltimes.cn/editorial/2010-06/540008.html

A symbol of its past hegemony, the US still likes to deploy aircraft carriers around the world when it wishes to disturb others. So far, no definitive answer has been given to speculation over whether the US will send a carrier to participate in joint military drills with South Korea in the Yellow Sea. But the possibility remains infuriating to many Chinese. Stationed in the Japanese port of Yokohama since 2008, the US carrier George Washington has been deployed to watch China's naval activity and flex its muscle in the West Pacific. It certainly intends to make its presence felt in the Yellow Sea and the East China Sea. But the US should reconsider its military movements in the West Pacific. Disguised as a move aimed at maintaining regional stability, the deployment of a carrier off of China's coast is a provocation that will generate hostility among the Chinese public toward the US. Who would not be bothered by an opponent hanging around at the door with a gun all day long? Many Chinese are tired of the abrupt changes in US posture. The US just stressed the importance of partnership between the two countries at the second Strategic and Economic Dialogue at the end of last month. Now, it looks as if the US could try to incite China with military aggression. Such a move would erode the hard-earned trust existing between the two countries. Each time the US has tried to provoke China militarily, it has brought bilateral relations to a nadir and damaged public trust, which takes time to rebuild.

### Impact Turn – China

#### US hegemony guarantees China war.

Christopher Layne, professor at Texas A&M University, January 2008, “China’s Challenge to US Hegemony,” Current History, http://acme.highpoint.edu/~msetzler/IR/IRreadingsbank/chinauscontain.ch08.6.pdf

China’s rise affects the United States because of what international relations scholars call the “power transition” effect: Throughout the history of the modern international state system, ascending powers have always challenged the position of the dominant (hegemonic) power in the international system—and these challenges have usually culminated in war. Notwithstanding Beijing’s talk about a “peaceful rise,” an ascending China inevitably will challenge the geopolitical equilibrium in East Asia. The doctrine of peaceful rise thus is a reassurance strategy employed by Beijing in an attempt to allay others’ fears of growing Chinese power and to forestall the United States from acting preventively during the dangerous transition period when China is catching up to the United States. Does this mean that the United States and China are on a collision course that will lead to a war in the next decade or two? Not necessarily. What happens in Sino-American relations largely depends on what strategy Washington chooses to adopt toward China. If the United States tries to maintain its current dominance in East Asia, Sino-American conflict is virtually certain, because us grand strategy has incorporated the logic of anticipatory violence as an instrument for maintaining American primacy. For a declining hegemon, “strangling the baby in the crib” by attacking a rising challenger preventively—that is, while the hegemon still holds the upper hand militarily—has always been a tempting strategic option.

### Impact Turn – Proliferation

#### US hegemony causes nuclear proliferation.

Matthew Yglesias, Fellow at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, 10/13/2009, “Decline: It’s Not Really a Choice,” http://yglesias.thinkprogress.org/archives/2009/10/decline-its-not-really-a-choice.php

Krauthammer’s central conceit ever since the end of the Cold War has been that bold acts of will can prolong the “unipolar moment” indefinitely. And he’s just wrong. He’s always been wrong, he continues to be wrong, and this interpretation of world affairs will always be wrong. It’s a remarkably elementary mistake that seems to evince no understanding of how the United States came to be the dominant global player in the first place. As if he thinks we’re top dog and nobody cares about Australia or Finland is because we just have more of a bad-ass attitude. Those are, however, actually some pretty bad-ass countries. They’re just, you know, small so nobody cares. If China and India were richer, we’d look small to them! The main practical consequence of Krauthammer-style policies for international relations is to speed the spread of nuclear weapons. Having us behave in an alarming manner increases the desire of regional powers to acquire nuclear weapons and decreases the extent to which other great powers are inclined to collaborate with us on preventing nuclear proliferation.

#### Hegemony is the key driving force for nuclear proliferation.

Steven Weber et al, professor of political science and director of the Institute of International Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, January-February 2007, “How Globalization Went Bad,” Foreign Policy, http://iis.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/how\_globalization\_went\_bad.pdf

The world is paying a heavy price for the instability created by the combination of globalization and unipolarity, and the United States is bearing most of the burden. Consider the case of nuclear proliferation. There’s effectively a market out there for proliferation, with its own supply (states willing to share nuclear technology) and demand (states that badly want a nuclear weapon). The overlap of unipolarity with globalization ratchets up both the supply and demand, to the detriment of U.S. national security. It has become fashionable, in the wake of the Iraq war, to comment on the limits of conventional military force. But much of this analysis is overblown. The United States may not be able to stabilize and rebuild Iraq. But that doesn’t matter much from the perspective of a government that thinks the Pentagon has it in its sights. In Tehran, Pyongyang, and many other capitals, including Beijing, the bottom line is simple: The U.S. military could, with conventional force, end those regimes tomorrow if it chose to do so. No country in the world can dream of challenging U.S. conventional military power. But they can certainly hope to deter America from using it. And the best deterrent yet invented is the threat of nuclear retaliation. Before 1989, states that felt threatened by the United States could turn to the Soviet Union’s nuclear umbrella for protection. Now, they turn to people like A.Q. Khan. Having your own nuclear weapon used to be a luxury. Today, it is fast becoming a necessity.

#### Multipolarity solves proliferation – incentives for other powers to prevent acquisition.

Steven Weber et al, professor of political science and director of the Institute of International Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, January-February 2007, “How Globalization Went Bad,” Foreign Policy, http://iis.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/how\_globalization\_went\_bad.pdf

How would things be different in a multipolar world? For starters, great powers could split the job of policing proliferation, and even collaborate on some particularly hard cases. It’s often forgotten now that, during the Cold War, the only state with a tougher nonproliferation policy than the United States was the Soviet Union. Not a single country that had a formal alliance with Moscow ever became a nuclear power. The Eastern bloc was full of countries with advanced technological capabilities in every area except one— nuclear weapons. Moscow simply wouldn’t permit it. But today we see the uneven and inadequate level of effort that non-superpowers devote to stopping proliferation. The Europeans dangle carrots at Iran, but they are unwilling to consider serious sticks. The Chinese refuse to admit that there is a problem. And the Russians are aiding Iran’s nuclear ambitions. When push comes to shove, nonproliferation today is almost entirely America’s burden.

## Highways Neg

### AT: IHS Deterioration

#### IHS deterioration is exaggerated

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

In recent years Americans have been besieged by reports that the nation is in the midst of an infrastructure crisis. Those claims are simply wrong, at least with respect to highways and bridges. Nationally, the number of bridges considered “structurally deficient” has declined in every year since 1990 (the earliest year for which data are available). Where nearly 138,000 bridges were so classified in 1990, by 2011 the number had declined more than 50 percent to less than 68,000 (see Figure 3).12 As there are more bridges today than in 1990, the percent- age of deficient bridges has declined even more.

#### Highway conditions improving

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Highway conditions have also steadily improved. One measure of highway condition is the International Roughness Index, which ranges from 0 to 300 with lower numbers being smoother. As shown in Table 2, this index has steadily improved for all major highway systems.

#### Local roads not the IHS are in danger

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

This doesn’t mean there are no problems with highway infrastructure. Local roads and bridges seem to be in poorer shape than state- owned ones. Local bridges, for example, are 60 percent more likely to be structurally deficient than state bridges. While the roughness index is not available for different ownerships, Table 2 indicates that interstate freeways are considerably smoother than other arterials. Since interstates are all state owned and other arterials are more likely to be locally owned, this suggests that local roads are rougher.

### AT: Solvency – Federal Funding Fails

#### Federal highway funding is misallocated and tied regulations undermine solvency

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

Today, the interstate highway system is long complete and federal financing has become an increasingly inefficient way to modernize America's highways. Federal spending is often misallocated to low-value activities, and the regulations that go hand-in-hand with federal aid stifle innovation and boost highway costs.

#### Federal highway funding is counterproductive – it reduces innovation and increases inefficiencies

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

This essay reviews the history of federal involvement in highways, describing the evolution from simple highway funding to today's attempts to centrally plan the transportation sector. It describes why federal intervention reduces innovation, creates inefficiencies in state highway systems, and damages society by reducing individual freedom and increasing highway fatalities. Taxpayers and transportation users would be better off if federal highway spending, fuel taxes, and related regulations were eliminated. State and local governments can tackle transportation without federal intervention. They should move toward market pricing for transportation usage and expand the private sector's role in the funding and operation of highways.

#### Aff solvency is only theoretical – Federal highway spending is misallocated in practice

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

Today, gasoline taxes and other revenues flowing into the FHTF total about $36 billion annually. Congress spends the money on highways and many other activities, often inefficiently. The following sections discuss six disadvantages of federal highway financing, and thus indicate the advantages of devolving highway financing to the states and private sector. 1. Funds Used Inefficiently and Diverted to Lower-Priority Projects Federal aid typically covers between 75 and 90 percent of the costs of federally supported highway projects. Because states spend only a small fraction of their own resources on these projects, state officials have less incentive to use funds efficiently and to fund only high-priority investments. Boston's Central Artery and Tunnel project (the "Big Dig"), for example, suffered from poor management and huge cost overruns. Federal taxpayers paid for more than half of the project's total costs, which soared from about $3 billion to about $15 billion.22

### AT: Solvency – Federal Funding Fails

#### Earmarking for pork barrel projects undermines solvency

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

Federal politicians often direct funds to projects in their states that are low priorities for the nation as a whole. The Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 1980s, "Tip" O'Neill, represented a Boston district and led the push for federal funding of the Big Dig. More recently, Representative Don Young of Alaska led the drive to finance that state's infamous "Bridge to Nowhere," discussed below. The inefficient political allocation of federal dollars can be seen in the rise of "earmarking" in transportation bills. This practice involves members of Congress slipping in funding for particular projects requested by special interest groups in their districts. In 1982, the prohibition on earmarks in highway bills in effect since 1914 was broken by the funding of 10 earmarks costing $362 million. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan vetoed a highway bill partly because it contained 121 earmarks, and Congress overrode his veto. Since then, transportation earmarking has grown by leaps and bounds. The 1991 transportation authorization bill (ISTEA) had 538 highway earmarks, the 1998 bill (TEA-21) had 1,850 highway earmarks, and the 2005 bill (SAFETEA-LU) had 5,634 highway earmarks. The earmarked projects in the 2005 bill cost $22 billion, thus indicating that earmarks are consuming a substantial portion of federal highway funding.

#### Money allocated for highways will get diverted to non-highway uses

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

Since 1982, increasing amounts of revenues from the FHTF have been diverted to non-highway uses. The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 raised the federal gas tax by five cents, with one-fifth of the increase dedicated to urban transit. The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act substituted "flexibility" and "intermodalism" for the "dedication" of fuel taxes to highways. That wording change meant that any transportation-related activity could lay claim to highway money. Under the most recent highway authorization—SAFETEA-LU of 2005—transportation scholar Randal O'Toole figures that only about 59 percent of highway trust fund dollars will be spent on highways. Funds from the FHTF will go to mass transit (21 percent), earmarks (8 percent), and a hodge-podge of other activities such as bicycle paths (12 percent). Note, however, that some of the earmark funds will also go to highways. The main diversion is to rail transit, which can be a very inefficient mode of transportation, as discussed in a related essay. Most Americans do not use rail transit and should not have to subsidize expensive subways and rail systems in a small number of major cities that prohibit the use of more modern and effective transit methods, such as shared taxis. As the FHWA table (www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/safetea- lu\_authorizations.xls) indicates, Congress allocates highway money to truck parking facilities, anti-racial profiling programs, magnetic levitation trains, and dozens of other non-road activities. O'Toole finds that the House version of upcoming transportation authorization legislation would reduce the highway portion of FHTF spending to just 20 percent. It would add high-speed rail at 10 percent, fund transit at 20 percent, and provide about 50 percent of the funds to the states to spend on "flexible" projects and earmarks.

### AT: Solvency – Federal Funding Fails

#### Federal funding undermines solvency because it’s inherently tied to wasteful regulations

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

The flow of federal funding to the states for highways comes part-in-parcel with top-down regulations. The growing mass of federal regulations makes highway building more expensive in numerous ways. First, federal specifications for road construction standards can be more demanding than state standards. But one-size-fits-all federal rules may ignore unique features of the states and not allow state officials to make efficient trade-offs on highway design. A second problem is that federal grants usually come with an array of extraneous federal regulations that increase costs. Highway grants, for example, come with Davis-Bacon rules and Buy America provisions, which raise highway costs substantially. Davis-Bacon rules require that workers on federally funded projects be paid "prevailing wages" in an area, which typically means higher union wages. Davis-Bacon rules increase the costs of federally funded projects by an average of about 10 percent, which wastes billions of dollars per year.27 Ralph Stanley, the entrepreneur who created the private Dulles Greenway toll highway in Virginia, estimated that federal regulations increase highway construction costs by about 20 percent.28 Robert Farris, who was commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Transportation and also head of the Federal Highway Administration, suggested that federal regulations increase costs by 30 percent.29 Finally, federal intervention adds substantial administrative costs to highway building. Planning for federally financed highways requires the detailed involvement of both federal and state governments. By dividing responsibility for projects, this split system encourages waste at both levels of government. Total federal, state, and local expenditures on highway "administration and research" when the highway trust fund was established in 1956 were 6.8 percent of construction costs. By 2002, these costs had risen to 17 percent of expenditures. The rise in federal intervention appears to have pushed up these expenditures substantially.

### AT: Solvency – Federal Funding Fails

#### Supporters of federal highway spending use flawed statistical data

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

Some states persistently receive more federal highway funding than they pay into the federal Highway Trust Fund. The Federal Highway Administration publishes Highway Statistics each year, showing the amounts the fund receives from each state and the allocation paid to each state from the fund. Supporters of federal highway financing use these figures to demonstrate how supposedly beneficial the current system is to all states. However, the receipts-and-allocations data presented in Highway Statistics are misleading. The FHWA divides the dollar amounts of the apportionments and allocations for each state by the amount of revenue paid into the fund by each state. The result is a ratio that overstates the benefits of the federal highway system to individual states for a number of reasons: Interest. Larger amounts are taken out of the trust fund than paid in —in other words, the grand total ratio exceeds 100 percent. For the whole period 1956–2008, the excess from the FHTF was around 13 percent, and for 2008 it was 32 percent. The excess is the result of interest earned on the fund's balances. But the interest on unspent balances does not represent additional resources that the federal government provides to the states. Minimum guarantee. The 1998 TEA-21 legislation included a "minimum guarantee" that no state would receive less than 90.5 percent of the amount it paid into the trust fund. The 2005 SAFETEA-LU reauthorization raised the minimum guarantee to 92 percent. To implement the guarantee from 1998, $35 billion—16 percent of the total authorized—was set aside to increase the shares of those states that, under the traditional formulas, received less than 90.5 percent of what they paid into the fund. Yet some of this money also went to states that were already receiving more than they paid into the fund, thereby doing little to remedy prior disparities. As there was no such guarantee before 1998, this rule's effect on total distributions over time cannot be gauged from data provided by the Federal Highway Administration. Exclusion of Mass Transit Account and non-road uses. The FHWA data excludes payments that are transferred to the Mass Transit Account and to other non-road uses. As these make up over 30 percent of fuel tax revenues, the data from the FHWA overstate the benefits of the federal highway program. A better way of showing the inequities between the states is to compare each state's share of money taken out of the highway trust fund as a ratio of the share it paid in.33 If a state's receipts were 3 percent of the whole, and its contribution 2 percent, the share ratio would be 1.5. I have presented such calculations elsewhere and found that there are substantial winner and loser states from the Highway Trust Fund.34 Similarly, a recent analysis by Ronald Utt found that half of the states are shortchanged by the current highway trust fund allocations.35 The Congressional Research Service notes that struggles over recent highway bills have focused on these interstate inequities (rather than on ways to make federal expenditures more productive), with the donor states tending to be in the South and Midwest and the donee states tending to be in the Northeast, Pacific Rim, and West.36 Finally, note that these analyses do not take into account the increased costs in every state from federal regulations and administrative costs. If these were taken into account, road users in very few states would derive any net benefits from federal highway financing.

#### Federal funding trades off with private highways that solve better

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

By subsidizing the states to provide seemingly "free" highways, federal financing discourages the construction and operation of privately financed highways. A key problem is that users of private highways are forced to pay both the tolls for those private facilities and the fuel taxes that support the government highways. Another problem is that private highway companies have to pay taxes, including property taxes and income taxes, while government agencies do not. Furthermore, private highways face higher borrowing costs because they must issue taxable bonds, whereas public agencies can issue tax-exempt bonds. The Dulles Greenway is a privately financed and operated highway in Northern Virginia, which cost investors about $350 million to build.3The Greenway must compete against nearby "free" state highways. It has been tough going, but the Greenway has survived for 15 years. Typical users of the Greenway pay 36 cents in federal and state gasoline taxes per gallon to support the government highways, plus they pay Greenway tolls, which range from $2.25 to $4.15 per trip for automobiles using electronic tolling. If the Greenway and other private highways were credited the amounts paid into state and federal highway funds, their tolls could be lowered and more traffic would be attracted to them. That would make better use of private capacity as it could develop in coming years and relieve congestion on other roads. Unfortunately, the proposed version of new highway legislation by the chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure would add new federal regulatory barriers to toll roads in the states.Section 1204 of the bill would create a federal "Office of Public Benefit" to ensure "protection of the public interest in relation to highway toll projects and public-private partnership agreements on federal-aid highways." This new office would be tasked with reviewing and approving or disapproving proposed toll rate increases on these projects, among other interventionist activities. This would completely flip around the idea of road tolling as a decentralized market-based mechanism and turn it into a central planning mechanism.

### AT: Solvency – Federal Funding Fails

#### Federal funded highways prevent HOT lanes that solve the case better

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, June 2010, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding#\_edn0

One of the promising advances to relieving urban congestion is High-Occupancy or Toll (HOT) highways. Networks of HOT lanes can be structured for use by vehicles with payment of variable tolls combined with buses at no charge. The tolls are collected electronically and set at levels high enough to ensure acceptable traffic conditions at all times. A current obstacle to expanding HOT lane programs is that it is difficult to add tolls to roads constructed with federal funds. The first HOT lanes in the United States were introduced in 1995 on California's State Route 91 near Anaheim. The California Private Transportation Company conceived, designed, financed, constructed, and opened two pairs of "express lanes" in the median of a 10-mile stretch of the highway.40 Express lane users pay tolls by means of identifiers, similar to those used by EZPass systems, with the payments debited electronically from accounts opened with the company. Following the lead of the private sector, California's public sector implemented a similar project on Route I-15 north of San Diego. It has also proven popular. The rates charged on the I-15 lanes are varied automatically in real time to respond to traffic conditions. HOT lanes have also been implemented in Denver and Minneapolis, and are planned for the Washington, D.C., area. Payments for the use of roads can now be made as easily as payments for the use of telephones, without vehicles having to stop. Such changes in payment methods can have profound effects on the management and financing of roads. If the federal government removed itself from highway financing, direct payments for road use could be made directly to state governments through tolls. These sorts of tolls are already in place in New York and New Jersey. An even better solution would be payment of tolls for road use directly to private highway companies, which would cut out government financing completely. This is now technically feasible. Following the success of the HOT lanes in Southern California, many other projects are being pursued across the country. One project is in Northern Virginia. Fluor-Transurban is building and providing most of the funding for HOT lanes on a 14-mile stretch of the Capital Beltway. Drivers will pay to use the lanes with electronic tolling, which will recoup the company's roughly $1 billion investment. HOT lane projects are attractive to governments because they can make use of existing capacity and because the tolls can pay for all or most of the costs. Such networks offer congestion-free expressways for those wanting to pay a premium price, in addition to reducing congestion on other roads and creating faster bus services. There are many exciting technological developments in highways, and ending federal intervention would make state governments more likely to seek innovative solutions. Technological advances—such as electronic tolling—have made paying for road services as simple as paying for other sorts of goods. In a world where a fuel tax that is levied on gasoline is an imperfect measure of the wear-and-tear each driver puts on roads, it is vital to explore better ways to finance highways.

### AT: Congestion

#### Congestion isn’t a problem – it’s an indication of a healthy economy not a threat

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 20

Traffic congestion is not essentially a problem. It’s the solution to our basic mobility problem, which is that too many people want to move at the same times each day. Efficient operation of the economy and our school systems requires that people go to work, go to school, and run errands during about the same hours so they can interact with each other. We cannot alter that basic requirement without crippling our economy and society. This problem marks every major metropolitan area in the world.

#### Highway congestion isn’t key to overall congestion

Brian Taylor, Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, Fall 2002, “Rethinking Traffic Congestion,” Access, Number 21, Pg. 10-11

Freeways form the backbone of nearly every metropolitan transportation network in the US. While they comprise only a small fraction of metropolitan street and high- way mileage, freeways carry more than a third of all vehicular travel. When people speak of congestion in cities, they typically mean freeway congestion, and most studies of metropolitan congestion focus mostly, if not exclusively, on freeway delay. But freeway delay may not be a meaningful way to measure how congestion affects people. Consider the following example. A commuter walks from her front door to her car, parked in her driveway. She drives a quarter mile on local streets to a larger collector 10 street, and then a half mile to a large arterial street. She then travels on the arterial for a couple miles to a freeway on-ramp. Once on the freeway, she drives in congested conditions for six miles, exits onto another arterial, and drives another mile and a half before entering a parking structure at her worksite. She makes three loops up to the third level of the structure, where she parks. Then she walks fifty yards, waits for an elevator which takes her to the first floor, enters another building, and waits for another elevator to take her to her fifth-floor office. In this example, the drive on the congested freeway accounts for well over half the travel distance, but much less than half the travel time. So even a dramatic fifty percent increase in travel speed on the congested freeway link of this trip would reduce the time of this sample commute by only five minutes—less than fifteen percent.

#### Non vehicle delays are more costly than highway congestion

Brian Taylor, Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, Fall 2002, “Rethinking Traffic Congestion,” Access, Number 21, Pg. 10-11

Travel behavior research has consistently found that transfer and waiting times— such as walking from the car to the office, or waiting for a bus or an elevator—comprise a large share of total trip times and are viewed by travelers as far more onerous than in- vehicle travel time. Most travelers would much rather reduce transfer and waiting times by five minutes than in-vehicle travel on a congested roadway by five minutes. So we cannot estimate congestion costs by simply measuring network delay. We must instead examine congestion’s influence on the choices firms and households make about location and travel. If delay on a congested freeway comprises only a small portion of someone’s commute, that person’s congestion costs are low even if congestion on the freeway network is high. And if a firm chooses to locate in a congested area that offers easy access to suppliers or customers, it is a mistake to consider congestion costs with- out balancing them against access benefits.

### AT: Solvency - Congestion

#### Congestion is inevitable – it can’t be solved

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 19

EVERYONE HATES TRAFFIC CONGESTION. But despite all attempted remedies, it keeps getting worse. Why don’t they do something about it? The answer: because rising traffic congestion is an inescapable condition in all large and growing metropolitan areas across the world, from Los Angeles to Tokyo, from Cairo to São Paulo. Peak-hour traffic congestion is a result of the way modern societies operate, and of residents’ habits that cause them to overload roads and transit systems every day.

#### Impossible to build enough roads to solve congestion

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 20

2. Greatly expand road capacity. The second approach to reducing congestion is to build enough additional road capacity to simultaneously accommodate all drivers who want to travel at peak hours. But this “cure” is totally impractical and prohibitively expensive. We would have to turn much of every metropolitan region into a giant concrete slab, and the resulting huge roads would be grossly underutilized in noncommuting hours. Although there are many occasions when adding more road capacity is a good idea, no large region can afford to build enough to completely eliminate peak-hour congestion.

#### Building more roads brings more traffic – can’t solve congestion

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 20

However, more roads will not bring an end to congestion. Instead, they will bring more traffic. The American economist Anthony Downs put forward this hypothesis more than four decades ago. He called this idea the “fundamental law of highway congestion”. According to an amazing paper by two Canadian economists, Downs really had a point. Gilles Duranton and Matthew Turner, both affiliated to the UniversityofToronto, empirically analysed the relationship between road building and traffic volumes and came to a very sobering conclusion: “increased provision of interstate highways and major urban roads is unlikely to relieve congestion of these roads.”

### AT: Solvency - Congestion

#### Can’t solve congestion because of the principle of triple convergence

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 20

The least understood aspect of peak-hour traffic congestion is the Principle of Triple Convergence. It works because traffic flows in any region’s overall transportation net-works almost automatically form self-adjusting relationships among different routes, times, and modes. Triple Convergence is the complex process of adaptation through which the various sectors of the metropolitan system adapt to changes in other sectors— specifically to changes in locations, times, and modes of travel. The Principle of Triple Convergence is best explained by a hypothetical example. Visualize a major commuting freeway so heavily congested each morning that traffic crawls for at least thirty minutes. If that freeway were magically doubled in capacity overnight, the next day traffic would flow rapidly because the same number of drivers would have twice as much road space. But very soon word would get around that this road was uncongested. Drivers who had formerly traveled before or after the peak hour to avoid congestion would shift back into that peak period. Drivers who had been using alternative routes would shift onto this now convenient freeway. Some commuters who had been using transit would start driv- ing on this road during peak periods. Within a short time, this triple convergence upon the expanded road during peak hours would make the road as congested as before its expansion. Experience shows that peak-hour congestion cannot be eliminated for long on a congested road by expanding that road’s capacity if it’s part of a larger transportation network.

#### Building more roads can’t solve congestion

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 20

1. Build more roads. Highway advocates claim we need to build more roads and expand many existing ones, but opponents say we cannot build our way out of congestion because more highway capacity will simply attract more travelers. Triple Convergence shows this is true for already-overcrowded roads. But large projected population growth means that we will need a lot more lane miles just to cope in growth areas. However, building roads will not eliminate current congestion, nor prevent it from arising on new roads.

#### Congestion will get worse no matter what counter-measures are taken

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 20

Peak-hour traffic congestion in almost all large and growing metropolitan regions around the world is here to stay. Indeed, it is almost certain to get worse during at least the next few decades, mainly because of rising populations and wealth. This will be true no matter what public and private policies are adopted to combat congestion. This outcome should not be regarded as a mark of social failure or wrong policies. In fact, traffic congestion reflects economic prosperity. People congregate in large numbers in those places where they most want to be. The conclusion that traffic congestion is inevitable does not mean it must grow unchecked. Several policies described here—especially if used in concert—could effec- tively slow congestion’s growth. But, aside from disastrous wars or other catastrophes, nothing can eliminate traffic congestion from large metropolitan regions here and around the world. Only serious recessions—which are hardly desirable—can even forestall its increasing. So my advice to traffic-plagued commuters is: relax and get used it. Get a comfort- able air-conditioned vehicle with a stereo system, a tape deck and CD player, a hands-free telephone, perhaps even a microwave oven, and commute daily with someone you really like. Learn to make congestion part of your everyday leisure time, because it is going to be your commuting companion for the foreseeable future

### Politics Links - Congress

#### Conservative GOP factions make highway spending politically infeasible

John Stanton, Roll Call Staff, 2/14/2012, “Boehner Scrambles to Save Highway Bill,” http://www.rollcall.com/news/boehner\_pulls\_highway\_package\_will\_break\_up\_measure-212405-1.html

But privately, GOP aides said leadership had come to terms with the fact that parochial divisions within the Republican Conference, united Democratic opposition and a conservative faction opposed to federal highway spending had made the measure politically unwieldy.

#### Increasing highway spending will be hugely controversial – congress is looking to make cuts

David Madland, Director of the American Worker Project at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, 3/22/2012, “Ties that Bind,” http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2012/03/middle\_class\_infrastructure.html

Yet infrastructure spending is unlikely to increase. The current Congress is poised to either keep spending at current insufficient levels or make cuts. The Senate majority recently passed a short, two-year extension of the transportation funding bill that continues spending at current levels. Reports on the draft-stage House majority transportation bill indicate that it will significantly reduce transportation funding, particularly for transit. Similarly, the forthcoming budget plan for fiscal year 2013 from the House majority cuts tens of billions of dollars in discretionary spending, which includes infrastructure spending, every year compared to the president’s budget while cutting taxes for the wealthy. The plan would reduce transportation infrastructure investment per capita by 28 percent from 2010 levels. Significant increases are not on the table in large part because of strong opposition to raising taxes to pay for the spending. The wealthy place a much higher priority on keeping taxes low than does the middle class, according to a number of academic studies.

#### Republicans will oppose new spending on highways

Fawn Johnson, Correspondent for National Journal, 1/3/2011, “Highway Trust Fund Battles,” http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2011/01/highway-trust-fund-battles.php

For House Republican leaders, it's about making sure spending on transportation projects is limited to the money available. That could be a big problem for anyone, including President Obama, who believes immediate infrastructure spending is essential to improving the economy, not to mention maintaining a road and bridge system that will keep its travelers safe.

### Politics Links - Public

#### A majority of Americans oppose new highway spending

Randy Simes, Owner and managing editor of urbancincy.com, 1/27/2009, “Boehner’s stimulus priorities contradict public opinion,” http://www.urbancincy.com/2009/01/boehners-stimulus-priorities-contradict-public-opinion/

Many Americans believe strongly that the infrastructure spending plan should look beyond widening our highways and building new roads. According to a recent study (pdf), 80% of Americans believe it’s more important that a stimulus plan include efforts to repair existing highways and build public transit rather than build new highways. 45% of those polled go on to say that construction of new highways should “definitely” or “probably” not be included in the plan. The American public has seen the days of highway spending dominate their lives. As a result we are damaging our environment, limiting our transportation choices, and negatively impacting our health. It appears as though House Minority Leader and Republican from West Chester Township, doesn’t agree. “I think there’s a place for infrastructure, but what kind of infrastructure? Infrastructure to widen highways, to ease congestion for American families? Is it to build some buildings that are necessary? But if we’re talking about beautification projects, or we’re talking about bike paths, Americans are not going to look very kindly on this.” -John Boehner (R-OH)

#### The public overwhelmingly thinks highway spending is ineffective

Emily Ekins, Director of polling for Reason Foundation, 1/4/2012, Sixty Two Percent of Americans Prioritize Spending on Roads Over Public Transit, http://reason.com/poll/2012/01/04/sixty-two-percent-of-american-prioritize

Americans overwhelmingly believe tax dollars spent on transportation are spent ineffectively (65 percent), whereas only 23 percent believe the money is spent well. Interestingly, there are substantial differences between those who take public transit and roads and perceptions of government wastefulness. Sixty six percent of those who commute on roads believe government spends transportation dollars ineffectively, while only 21 percent disagree. In contrast, 41 percent of public transit users believe government does spend effectively.

#### Massive public opposition to increases in gas taxes needed to pay for highway spending

Wall Street Journal, 2/28/2011, “Poll: Yes on Highway Spending, No on Higher Gas Tax to Fund It,” http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2011/02/28/poll-yes-on-highway-spending-no-on-higher-gas-tax-to-fund-it/?blog\_id=24&post\_id=28898

Most Americans support more investment in highways, bridges and transit systems but are solidly opposed to raising the national gasoline tax as a funding option, according to a national survey released by the Rockefeller Foundation. The study helps explain the impasse in Washington as President Barack Obama calls for transportation investments: Many lawmakers agree on the need for more highway spending but are averse to taking politically risky steps to raise funding. The survey was conducted jointly by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies between Jan. 29 and Feb. 6, and has a 3.1 percentage point margin of error. Seven in 10 said they wanted elected leaders to seek compromise, rather than hold fast to their position, on legislation for transportation infrastructure. That’s a higher portion than those who urged compromise in addressing the federal budget deficit, tax cuts, entitlements and other issues. Two-thirds of respondents–including majorities of Democrats, Republicans and independents–said that improving transportation infrastructure is “important.” And 80% agreed that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation systems would boost local economies and create jobs. But only 27% said that raising the federal gasoline tax would be an “acceptable” way to provide more highway funding. The 18.4-cent federal tax on a gallon of gasoline provides most funding for transportation projects, and many groups, including the Chamber of Commerce, have called for raising the gas tax. Instead, most survey respondents supported more private investment as an acceptable option for raising more transportation money.

### Spending Links

#### Just repairing IHS bridges will cost hundres of billions of dollars

John Schoen, Senior producer at MSNBC.com, 8/3/2007, “U.S. highway system badly in need of repair,” http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/20095291/ns/business-eye\_on\_the\_economy/t/us-highway-system-badly-need-repair/#.T8cEsb-kTjE

Over 2,000 bridges on the interstate highway system are in need of an overhaul, according to Frank Moretti, TRIP's director of research. It's not clear just how many of those bridges are unsafe. According to the Federal Highway Administration, most bridges in the U.S. Highway Bridge Inventory — 83 percent — are inspected every two years. About 12 percent, those in bad shape, are inspected annually, and 5 percent, those in very good shape, every four years. The Department of Transportation’s inspector general last year criticized the Highway Administration’s oversight of interstate bridges, saying that flawed calculations of weight limits could pose safety hazards. The Highway Administration agreed its oversight of state bridge inspections needed to be improved. Several governors on Wednesday ordered state transportation officials to inspect particular bridges or review their inspection procedures. It's also not clear just how much all this repair will cost, but some estimates put the price tag in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

#### Highway repair and expansion will be incredibly expensive – prices for raw materials and oil have inflated construction and maintenance costs

John Schoen, Senior producer at MSNBC.com, 8/3/2007, “U.S. highway system badly in need of repair,” http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/20095291/ns/business-eye\_on\_the\_economy/t/us-highway-system-badly-need-repair/#.T8cEsb-kTjE

One reason for the backlog is that funding for highway repair and improvements hasn’t kept up with rising construction and maintenance costs, which have far outstripped the overall inflation rate. The biggest reason: strong global demand for building materials like steel and concrete have pushed up prices of those raw materials. Higher oil prices have raised the cost of asphalt and the diesel fuel need to power road-building equipment.

#### Costs will escalate out of control – the big dig proves

ABC News, 12/4/2011, "Why Highways Become So Expensive," abcnews.go.com/WNT/story?id=129962&page=1#.T8cqv7-kTjE

Fixing the traffic mess often creates a financial mess. Take, for instance, Boston's famous "Big Dig." Its backers say it's badly needed to reconfigure the highways through one of America's most crowded downtowns, but since inception its budget has grown from $5 billion to $14.4 billion

### Spending Links

#### Aff costs can’t be offset by gasoline taxes and other charges

Veronique de Rugy, Senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, 6/17/2011, “The Facts about Transportation Spending,” www.roadsbridges.com/highway-construction-spending-expected-show-little-growth-2009

Myth 1: Highways and roads pay for themselves thanks to gasoline taxes and other charges to motorists. Fact 1: They don’t. Gas taxes and other highway user fees pay less today than ever before. In 1957 about 67 percent of highway funds came from user fees. Forty years later the revenue from user fees has shrunk to just 50 percent of total highway funds. Indeed, user fee revenue as a share of total highway-related funds is now at its lowest point since the Interstate Highway System was created. And the difference is now made up by taxes and fees not directly related to highway use. These include revenue generated by sales and property taxes, general fund appropriations, investment income, and various bond issues.

#### Economic benefits from highway spending do not outweigh costs

Edward Glaeser, Professor of Economics at Harvard, 8/15/2011, “Highway Spending Often a Dead-End Investment: Edward Glaeser,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-08-16/highway-spending-often-a-dead-end-investment-edward-glaeser.html

There is a time to spend and a time to cut and we are now in an age of austerity. Even since Standard & Poor’s downgraded the U.S.’s AAA credit rating earlier this month, some Keynesians still favor more spending. They say the threat that the economy will dip back into recession calls for more public outlay. They are right that the recovery is weak. Seasonally adjusted unemployment remains at 9.1 percent, and among people older than 20 the rate actually fell from June to July, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Europe’s debt problems are unsolved and the U.S. stock market is extraordinarily volatile. But Congress has made clear it won’t respond by spending more money -- and that is probably a good thing. In the past, stimulus funding has been aimed at improving roads, airports and other forms of infrastructure. Yet it’s not at all clear that such spending provides enough value for the dollar. Consider, for example, spending on highways. President Barack Obama’s 2012 budget called for investing $556 billion on surface transportation over the next six years. If we spend an extra $100 billion building roads, we boost the economy and reduce unemployment. But if the $100 billion spent generates only $50 billion worth of value to drivers in the form of safety and faster, smoother commutes, then it’s not necessarily worth the price. Unfortunately, as the Office of Management and Budget noted when it evaluated federal spending on highways, in most cases “funding is not based on need or performance and has been heavily earmarked.”

#### Highway expansion is incredibly expensive

Joshua Schank, President and CEO of Eno Transportation Foundation, 5/3/2011, “No More "Free" Highways,” http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2011/05/do-we-need-more-highways.php

The Mayors are absolutely right that highway expansion should be a low priority - because highways as we have traditionally built them in this country have been perceived as free of charge. 80% of Mayors feel this way most likely because in 80% of cities, it would be a gross misallocation of public resources to invest in brand new "free" highways. In many urban cores, highways can be a disruptive, expensive, and inefficient way to move people. This is why, ultimately, many legs of the Interstate System (where tolls are prohibited) within cities were never built.

### States CP

#### Federal highway management fails – states would do a better job

Fawn Johnson, Correspondent for National Journal, 5/21/2012, “Not Waiting for the Feds,” http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/not-waiting-for-the-feds.php?print=true&printcomment=2212918

The transportation community in the states should want the federal government to be fired. Over the next few weeks, they are waiting for negotiators in Congress to pass a highway bill. If lawmakers are successful (and there is no guarantee of that), a few much-needed updates to the transportation program would be in place. But then it will only be 18 months, at most, until policymakers have to address again a handful of percolating problems like shoring up the highway trust fund for the long term. If the chambers can't reach agreement, that likely means a shorter extension of current highway authority. Cuts are possible. This scenario does not offer a ringing endorsement of the federal government as transportation caretaker. The inability of Congress and the White House to articulate and carry out a federal infrastructure policy could give credence to arguments from the right that the states would do a better job of regulating and funding their own transportation. But then Rep. Peter DeFazio, D-Ore., colorfully points out the very real problem with that idea--the highway to nowhere. DeFazio has a poster of a Kansas turnpike in 1956 that ends in a farmer's field in Oklahoma. "Devolution, baby! That's where we're headed," he said when showing it off in the Capitol in March.

#### Devolving highway control to the states solves best –one size fits all solutions fail

Gabriel Roth, Research fellow at the Independent Institute, 5/21/2012, “Not Waiting for the Feds,” http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/not-waiting-for-the-feds.php?print=true&printcomment=2212918

The principle of “subsidiarity” postulates that government decisions should occur at the lowest practicable level, for example locally rather than nationally. This principle suggests that it is indeed time to relieve the federal government of the burden of financing transportation infrastructure, and of the onus of having to raise the required fees or taxes, and return these responsibilities to the states. The following reasons come to mind: 1. The purpose of federal financing — completion of the Interstate Highway System — has been virtually achieved, and it is difficult to identify other advantages from federal financing. 2. The disadvantages of federal financing — increased costs and intrusive regulation — are evident and substantial. 3. Congress, unable to increase the taxes dedicated to roads, seeks to use general funds to finance some of the transportation expenditures it considers necessary, thus abandoning the US traditional “user pays” principle for roads. 4. Congress keeps deferring long-term road legislation and substituting short-term-extensions of previous (2005) legislation, thus hindering long-term planning of transportation projects. 5. New methods to pay for road use — such as mileage-based user fees to replace fuel taxes — are more likely to succeed as a result of innovations sought by different states, than if imposed by a federal government seeking a “one size fits all” solution.

#### States solve better for highways

Sean Kilcarr, Senior Editor at Fleet Owner, 5/16/2012, “Marking the “devolution” of highway funding,” http://fleetowner.com/regulations/marking-devolution-highway-funding

We’ve argued in the past that responsibility for generating highway funds should ‘devolve’ to the states, but now that’s a largely ‘defacto reality’ as declining HTF revenues are forcing the states to look for new ways to generate the monies they need,” Scriber told Fleet Owner. Scriber said the members of the policy panel – Adrian Moore, Ph.D.,vp-policy with the Reason Foundation; Gabriel Roth, research fellow at the Independent Institute; and Randall O’Toole, senior fellow with the Cato Institute – largely agreed that the federal government should remove itself from the highway funding process and let states take over. “It’s inherently more efficient for the states to handle this rather than add in the extra step of the federal government collecting and then redistributing fuel taxes,” Scriber pointed out. “Also note that Congress has not increased federal fuel excise tax rates since 1993. Since then, inflation has eroded the buying power of those tax dollars by more than one-third. This has pushed the HTF to the brink of insolvency, yet none of the proposals pending before Congress address this imminent threat to our nation’s surface transportation infrastructure.”

### Privatization CP

#### Congestion, disrepair, and accidents all prove government mismanagement of highways – privatization solves

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 12

What reasons are there for advocating the free-market approach for the highway industry? First and foremost is the fact that the present government ownership and management has failed. The death toll, the suffocation during urban rush hours, and the poor state of repair of the highway stock are all eloquent testimony to the lack of success which has marked the reign of government control. Second, and perhaps even more important, is a reason for this state of affairs. It is by no means an accident that government operation has proven to be a debacle and that private enterprise can succeed where government has failed.

#### The free market ensures highest quality roads – government control is incompetent

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 10

It is not only that government has been staffed with incompetents. The roads authorities are staffed, sometimes, with able management. Nor can it be denied that at least some who have achieved high rank in the world of private business have been incompetent. The advantage enjoyed by the market is the automatic reward and penalty system imposed by profits and losses. When customers are pleased, they continue patronizing those merchants who have served them well. These businesses are thus allowed to earn a profit. They can prosper and expand. Entrepreneurs who fail to satisfy, on the other hand, are soon driven to bankruptcy. This is a continual process repeated day in, day out. There is always a tendency in the market for the reward of the able and the deterrence of those who are not efficient. Nothing like perfection is ever reached, but the continual grinding down of the ineffective and rewarding of the competent, brings about a level of managerial skill unmatched by any other system. Whatever may be said of the political arena, it is one which completely lacks this market process. Although there are cases where capability rises to the fore, there is no continual process which promotes this. Because this is well known, even elementary, we have entrusted the market to produce the bulk of our consumer goods and capital equipment. What is difficult to see is that this analysis applies to the provision of roads no less than to fountain pens, frisbees, or fishsticks.

#### Privatizing roads would provide better transportation infrastructure at lower costs

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. viii

Lest you think your money would be going up in exhaust fumes, remember that market firms, who must please customers to stay in business, provide everything better and less expensively than government, without that nasty moral hangover of forcing people to pay for things they may not use or want. Your gasoline price already includes forty to fifty cents per gallon in taxes for road building and maintenance. This means I’m paying twenty-five to thirty-three dollars per month for road use now. With privatization of roads, that cost would go down, probably considerably. It happens every time anything is moved from government hands into private hands.

### Privatization CP

#### Privatization solves highway congestion

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. ix

Anyone who wanted to build a new interstate would face the huge task of buying up land crossing perhaps hundreds of miles. Widening existing highways would be more likely. In Los Angeles and other large cities where traffic is consistently choked, road owners would have the incentive, and plenty of funds, to buy property along highways so they could widen them. Owners would also have incentives to improve interchanges, such as Spaghetti Junction in Atlanta. Roads would improve overall. (I interviewed a county road engineer years ago, and he told me they design circular entrance ramps deliberately with varying radii—experienced as odd changes in the curve, which force you to constantly readjust the steering wheel—to “keep drivers awake.” How many of us have trouble keeping focused for fifteen seconds on a curving entrance ramp?)

#### Privatization solves highway pollution

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. viii

Pollution and pollution controls on automobiles would also be handled by road privatization. If auto pollution were to grow too thick, people living near the offending roads would sue the biggest, most obvious target: the road owners. Road owners would therefore charge higher fees for cars without up-to-date inspection stickers. Auto manufacturers would build pollution- control equipment into cars, and advertise how cleanly they run. Automakers do this already, but under the gun of a government that mandates pollution levels and what kind of pollution controls manufacturers use. Without government interference, engineers would be free to compete to provide different technologies to reduce costs and improve horsepower while providing cleaner burning engines. With the inspection stickers being coded to your automobile’s age, manufacturer, and model, there might be a separate pollution rider on your monthly statement. Drivers of new Hondas might see a discount, while drivers of old belchers would pay fees that might be higher than the road tolls themselves.

#### The counterplan spills over – demonstrating free market success fuels further privatization

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. xvi

Another benefit of the present book is that it attempts to demonstrate the viability, efficaciousness, and, yes, morality, of the private enterprise system, addressing a difficult case in point. If we can establish that private property and the profit motive can function even in “hard cases” such as roads, the better we can make the overall case on behalf of free enterprise.

### VMF CP

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should phase out federal gas taxes and implement a vehicle-mile fee system for Interstate Highways

#### VMF reduces congestion and creates a sustainable funding source for highway improvement

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

To fix these and other problems with gas taxes, this paper proposes an affordable vehicle-mile fee system that preserves traveler privacy, eliminates nearly all traffic congestion, adequately funds all federal, state, and local roads, and does so in a revenue-neutral manner after eliminat- ing gas taxes and local road subsidies. In fact, in the long run the proposal may even reduce total road costs and fees because it would give road agencies incentives to operate more efficiently.

#### Price measures key to solve congestion – however gas taxes can’t keep up with inflation and need to be replaced

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

This congestion is related to several other problems with America’s system of high- ways, roads, and streets. First, the system of financing roads using gasoline taxes fails to keep up with inflation and increasingly fuel- efficient cars. After adjusting for inflation, the amount of gas tax motorists pay for every mile they drive is only one-third the amount paid in 1956, the year Congress created the Interstate Highway System.

#### VMF raises enough revenues to maintain highways and establishes a deterrent to congestion

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Instead of raising gas taxes, this paper proposes to finance highways, roads, and streets through an entirely new system. This system would replace gasoline taxes with vehicle-mile fees collected electronically while preserving traveler privacy. The revenue from these fees would be directed to the actual owners of the roads used, thus ensuring that local governments or other road owners have sufficient funds to maintain and operate roads without subsidies. Fees could vary by time of day in order to prevent congestion by encouraging people to drive at less congested times, thus making better use of the road system. Making state and local road agencies self-sufficient would help insulate them from political pressure from groups who mistakenly view highways as a cultural issue.

### VMF CP

#### Reliance on federal funding creates incentives for local governments to defer maintenance – VMF solves

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

The poor maintenance record at the local level likely reflects local governments’ dependence on general funds rather than user fees. Lacking a steady source of fees, and under pressure to use general funds on other activities, local governments are more likely to defer maintenance than are state governments. Changing local highway finance to a user-fee system is likely to reduce deficient bridges and improve road conditions significantly.

#### VMF solves congestion – increases highway mobility

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Mobility has an important value, and the greatest benefit of a vehicle-mile fee system is that it can easily be used to eliminate congestion. This in turn would greatly enhance the mobility of the large numbers of people who need to travel during the busy periods of the day.

#### VMF reduces congestion and create more effective government spending on highways

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Replacing gas taxes with vehicle-mile fees would save more than $100 billion a year by reducing congestion, relieve local governments of the need to find $30 billion a year in general funds to support roads, and make road providers more responsive to users because the providers would depend on users, rather than politicians, for revenues. This change would also greatly reduce the tendency for Congress and state legislatures to spend transportation funds inefficiently as pork.

### VMF CP

#### Pricing is the only way to create a sustainable solution to congestion and highway maintenance

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Economists have long proposed to use pricing to relieve congestion because con- gestion pricing would avoid the shift-back problem. If tolls increase as the usage rate increases, and the maximum tolls are high enough that actual flows never exceed the maximum capacities, then road capacities are nearly doubled for those hours that flows would otherwise break down into stop-and- go traffic. An additional benefit is that the revenue generated from the tolls would be used to operate, maintain, and expand the roadway where the toll was collected. This policy is usually presented as a choice: people can sit in traffic, which is a deadweight-loss to society, or they can pay a toll and avoid congestion and know that their toll fee is doing some good, such as improving roads to relieve congestion. Yes, tolls would lead some people to change their departure times to avoid the tolls, but people are already changIn most cities, there is good reason to think that actual traffic flows exceedng their departure times to avoid the congestion.

#### VMF can double highway capacity

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Congestion-pricing advocates rarely mention the subtle effect of congestion: the hours of delay after traffic flows fall below the maxi- mum flow capacities. By using tolls to prevent congestion, highway capacities can be nearly doubled for several hours of the day, thus making it possible for many people to shift their departure times back to times they would have considered preferable were it not for the congestion. In other words, paradoxically, tolls actually increase highway capacities and allow more people to travel when they want to travel.

#### Multiple empirical examples prove VMF solvency

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

Congestion pricing of entire freeway networks has been successfully used to relieve congestion in several cities around the world. In 2004 Santiago de Chile introduced variable tolling of major highways in the city, and this proved to greatly reduce travel times and improve highway safety. Norway instituted congestion pricing on major highways in Bergen, Oslo, and Trondheim, which has both helped finance those roads and relieved congestion. Several highways in France use congestion pricing of all lanes, which has significantly reduced traffic delay. In the United States, congestion pricing of all lanes, as opposed to HOT lanes, has relieved congestion on bridges in New York City and San Francisco as well as on several bridges and highways in Florida.

## Space Elevator Neg

### Inherency – NASA Space Elevator Now

#### NASA is already looking into a space elevator

Robert Longley, 2012, “NASA Plans Elevators to Space,” http://usgovinfo.about.com/library/weekly/aa041702a.htm

Open your imagination now. You hop into the elevator and hit the button for the 11,457,600th floor. Hope you dressed warmly, because when you hop out, you'll be hopping right into space. Science fiction? Not anymore, says NASA. Amid soaring costs of space shuttle flights, new security concerns, and repeated launch delays, NASA scientists continue to look for slower, yet simpler and reusable ways of getting satellites and into space. One of those ways may just be the space elevator. According to NASA, a space elevator would essentially be a long cable with one end attached to a point on the Earth's equator while the other end remains held by its own outward centripetal force some some 22,187 miles (35,787-kilometers) directly overhead in a geostationary orbit. Magnetically powered vehicles would climb the cable, serving as a mass transportation system for moving people, satellites and other payloads between the Earth and space. The space elevator is really a spin-off of an earlier NASA plan for lifting objects into orbit without rockets called Space Towers.

#### NASA already wants to build one

Robert Longley, 2012, “NASA Plans Elevators to Space,” http://usgovinfo.about.com/library/weekly/aa041702a.htm

To build a space elevator, NASA would first use the space shuttle to carry reels holding a thin inner-layer of cable into orbit. The cable would then be unrolled with the free end being snaked down from orbit and attached to an anchoring station located somewhere on the Earth's equator. To stabilize the upper-end of the cable, an artificial "asteroid" would be attached to act as a counterweight. With the initial inner cable in place, automated "climbers" would then begin adding additional strengthening layers of cable from the ground up. Total construction time is estimated by NASA at three to five years. For a cable strong enough to withstand the enormous forces involved, NASA pins its hopes on a newly developed "carbon nanotube" material shown in tests to be over 100 times stronger than steel. The billions of dollars needed to build the first space elevator would more than be recovered through both its commercial potential and downright costs savings, say NASA planners.

#### NASA researchers are already working on it

NASA, 9-7-2000, “Audacious and Outrageous: Space Elevators,” http://science.nasa.gov/science-news/science-at-nasa/2000/ast07sep\_1/

Does this sound like the Sci-Fi Channel or a chapter out of Arthur C. Clarke's, Fountains of Paradise? Well, it's not. It is a real possibility -- a "space elevator" -- that researchers are considering today as a far-out space transportation system for the next century. David Smitherman of NASA/Marshall's Advanced Projects Office has compiled plans for such an elevator that could turn science fiction into reality. His publication, Space Elevators: An Advanced Earth-Space Infrastructure for the New Millennium, is based on findings from a space infrastructure conference held at the Marshall Space Flight Center last year. The workshop included scientists and engineers from government and industry representing various fields such as structures, space tethers, materials, and Earth/space environments. "This is no longer science fiction," said Smitherman. "We came out of the workshop saying, 'We may very well be able to do this.'"

### Inherency – Others Building Space Elevator Now

#### Japan will build a space elevator by 2050 now

Emily Butcher, 2-27-2012, “Space Elevator to be Operable by 2050,” Construction Digital, http://www.constructiondigital.com/innovations/space-elevators-to-be-operable-by-2050

Is the thrill of an African safari or scuba diving off the Great Barrier Reef failing to provide the novelty you crave from a dream vacation? As soon as 2050, according to Japanese construction company Obayashi Corp., a trendy vacation spot could be a spaceport offering a stellar view of Earth’s surface 60,000 miles below. Representatives of the Tokyo-based company spoke to Japan’s Yomiuri Shimbun newspaper last Wednesday, describing their hopes of building an operational space elevator using carbon nanotubes. The statement came after the discovery that the material – strong and light enough to potentially construct the perilously long cable – could make the dream a reality.

#### Japanese companies are building one

Mike Wall, 2-23-2012, “This Japanese Company Is Building An Elevator To Space,” Business Insider, http://articles.businessinsider.com/2012-02-23/home/31090119\_1\_space-elevators-quarters-and-laboratory-space-carbon-nanotubes

People could be gliding up to space on high-tech elevators by 2050 if a Japanese construction company's ambitious plans come to fruition. Tokyo-based Obayashi Corp. wants to build an operational space elevator by the middle of the century, Japan's Yomiuri Shimbun newspaper reported Wednesday (Feb. 22). The device would carry passengers skyward at about 124 mph (200 kph), delivering them to a station 22,000 miles (36,000 kilometers) above Earth in a little more than a week. In Obayashi's vision, a cable would be stretched from a spaceport on Earth's surface up to an altitude of 60,000 miles (96,000 km), or about one-quarter of the distance between our planet and the moon. A counterweight at its end would help "anchor" the cable in space.

#### Japan isn’t the only one looking into it

Mike Wall, 2-23-2012, “This Japanese Company Is Building An Elevator To Space,” Business Insider, http://articles.businessinsider.com/2012-02-23/home/31090119\_1\_space-elevators-quarters-and-laboratory-space-carbon-nanotubes

"At this moment, we cannot estimate the cost for the project," an Obayashi official said, according to Yomiuri Shimbun. "However, we'll try to make steady progress so that it won't end just up as simply a dream." Obayashi is not the only entity taking this dream seriously. For example, NASA researchers released a lengthy report more than a decade ago citing the potential of carbon nanotubes to make space elevators possible. And the agency has sponsored the Space Elevator Games, a contest to develop precursors to this longed-for transportation system.

### AT: Colonization Advantage – No Asteroids

#### Asteroids won’t cause extinction – none will hit earth and we’d be able to deflect it

Robert Roy Britt, Live Science, 8-7-2008, “Will an Asteroid Hit Earth?” http://www.livescience.com/mysteries/070116\_asteroid\_hit.html

But no, a continent-destroying asteroid is not likely to hit during your lifetime. Most of 1,100 or so that could do the job have been found. And none are on their way. Okay, there is one mid-sized rock—called Apophis—that has a small chance of striking Earth in 2036 and wreaking some regional havoc. But astronomers are watching it and, if future observations reveal it really could hit us, scientists are confident they can devise a mission to deflect it. And if all else fails, some futurists suggests, humanity could simply set up shop elsewhere.

#### Asteroids path has been redefined, no chance of impact.

Dwayne Brown and DC Angle, NASA Scientists, 10-7-2009, “NASA Refines Asteroid Apophis' Path Toward Earth”, NASA, “http://www.nasa.gov/home/hqnews/2009/oct/HQ\_09-232\_Apophis\_Update.html”

PASADENA, Calif. -- Using updated information, NASA scientists have recalculated the path of a large asteroid. The refined path indicates a significantly reduced likelihood of a hazardous encounter with Earth in 2036. The Apophis asteroid is approximately the size of two-and-a-half football fields. The new data were documented by near-Earth object scientists Steve Chesley and Paul Chodas at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, Calif. They will present their updated findings at a meeting of the American Astronomical Society's Division for Planetary Sciences in Puerto Rico on Oct. 8. "Apophis has been one of those celestial bodies that has captured the public's interest since it was discovered in 2004," said Chesley. "Updated computational techniques and newly available data indicate the probability of an Earth encounter on April 13, 2036, for Apophis has dropped from one-in-45,000 to about four-in-a million." A majority of the data that enabled the updated orbit of Apophis came from observations Dave Tholen and collaborators at the University of Hawaii's Institute for Astronomy in Manoa made. Tholen pored over hundreds of previously unreleased images of the night sky made with the University of Hawaii's 88-inch telescope, located near the summit of Mauna Kea. Tholen made improved measurements of the asteroid's position in the images, enabling him to provide Chesley and Chodas with new data sets more precise than previous measures for Apophis. Measurements from the Steward Observatory's 90-inch Bok telescope on Kitt Peak in Arizona and the Arecibo Observatory on the island of Puerto Rico also were used in Chesley's calculations. The information provided a more accurate glimpse of Apophis' orbit well into the latter part of this century. Among the findings is another close encounter by the asteroid with Earth in 2068 with chance of impact currently at approximately three-in-a-million. As with earlier orbital estimates where Earth impacts in 2029 and 2036 could not initially be ruled out due to the need for additional data, it is expected that the 2068 encounter will diminish in probability as more information about Apophis is acquired.

#### Apophis won’t hit earth – newest data

John Johnson, 10-7-2009, “2036 asteroid strike,” LA Times, http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-sci-asteroid8-2009oct08,0,3012588.story

Doomsday in 2036 just got a lot less likely. After recalculating the trajectory of the asteroid Apophis, scientists at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in La Canada Flintridge have determined that the odds of it hitting the Earth that year are only four in a million. "We've all but ruled out" a collision in 2036, said Steve Chesley, an astronomer with the Near-Earth Object office at JPL. Previously, the odds had been calculated at one in 45,000, Chesley said. While that doesn't sound like a very big danger, Apophis has been the greatest worry since 2004 for scientists who track threats from space. At that time, it appeared the asteroid had a 2.7% chance of hitting the Earth in 2029.

### AT: Colonization Advantage – Colonization Impossible

#### Limited human adaptation, radiation and travel time prevent colonization

Charlie Stross, author specializing in technically accurate sci-fi, 6-16-2007, “The High Frontier, Redux,” http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/06/the\_high\_frontier\_redux.html

We're human beings. We evolved to flourish in a very specific environment that covers perhaps 10% of our home planet's surface area. (Earth is 70% ocean, and while we can survive, with assistance, in extremely inhospitable terrain, be it arctic or desert or mountain, we aren't well-adapted to thriving there.) Space itself is a very poor environment for humans to live in. A simple pressure failure can kill a spaceship crew in minutes. And that's not the only threat. Cosmic radiation poses a serious risk to long duration interplanetary missions, and unlike solar radiation and radiation from coronal mass ejections the energies of the particles responsible make shielding astronauts extremely difficult. And finally, there's the travel time. Two and a half years to Jupiter system; six months to Mars. Now, these problems are subject to a variety of approaches — including medical ones: does it matter if cosmic radiation causes long-term cumulative radiation exposure leading to cancers if we have advanced side-effect-free cancer treatments? Better still, if hydrogen sulphide-induced hibernation turns out to be a practical technique in human beings, we may be able to sleep through the trip. But even so, when you get down to it, there's not really any economically viable activity on the horizon for people to engage in that would require them to settle on a planet or asteroid and live there for the rest of their lives. In general, when we need to extract resources from a hostile environment we tend to build infrastructure to exploit them (such as oil platforms) but we don't exactly scurry to move our families there. Rather, crews go out to work a long shift, then return home to take their leave. After all, there's no there there — just a howling wilderness of north Atlantic gales and frigid water that will kill you within five minutes of exposure. And that, I submit, is the closest metaphor we'll find for interplanetary colonization. Most of the heavy lifting more than a million kilometres from Earth will be done by robots, overseen by human supervisors who will be itching to get home and spend their hardship pay. And closer to home, the commercialization of space will be incremental and slow, driven by our increasing dependence on near-earth space for communications, positioning, weather forecasting, and (still in its embryonic stages) tourism. But the domed city on Mars is going to have to wait for a magic wand or two to do something about the climate, or reinvent a kind of human being who can thrive in an airless, inhospitable environment. Colonize the Gobi desert, colonise the North Atlantic in winter — then get back to me about the rest of the solar system!

#### Space colonization is impossible – distances are too big and planets are inhospitable

Donald F. Robertson, freelance space journalist, 3-6-2006, “Space Exploration,” Space News, http://www.space.com/spacenews/archive06/RobertsonOpEd\_030606.html

Two largely unquestioned assumptions long ago took root within the space community. As we prepare to voyage back to Earth's Moon and on to Mars, it is time to question them both. The first assumption is that exploring the Moon, Mars, or any part of the solar system, can be accomplished in a generation or two and with limited loss of life. The second is that we can use robots to successfully understand another world. Both assumptions are almost certainly wrong, yet many important elements of our civil space program are based on one or both of them being correct. To paraphrase Douglas Adams, even within the space community most people don't have a clue how "mind-boggingly big space really is." Most of the major worlds in the solar system have surface areas at least as large as terrestrial continents -- a few are much larger -- and every one of them is unremittingly hostile to human life. Learning to travel confidently through former President John F. Kennedy's "this new ocean" will be difficult, expensive, time-consuming and dangerous. Mr. Kennedy's rhetoric was more accurate than he probably knew. The only remotely comparable task humanity has faced was learning to travel across our world's oceans. We take trans-oceanic travel for granted, but getting from Neolithic boats to modern freighters cost humanity well over 10,000 years of hard work and uncounted lives. Even today, hundreds of people die in shipping accidents every year. We and our woefully inadequate chemical rockets are like Stone Age tribesfolk preparing to cast off in canoes, reaching for barely visible islands over a freezing, storm-tossed, North Atlantic.

#### Colonization impossible

Giancarlo Genta, Technical University of Turin, and Michael Rycroft, International Space University, 2003, Space, The Final Frontier? p. 309-10

The colonisation of nearby, or even more distant, planetary systems is unlikely to be a realistic means for easing the overpopulation problems of the Earth. It will never be possible for a significant number of human beings to leave our planet to find a better life on some extrasolar system or, for that matter, on some other body in our own solar system. What would be valuable would be for a few members of the human species to establish remote space colonies, thereby enabling the species to perpetuate itself if—or rather when — human life becomes extinct, for whatever reason, on planet Earth.

### AT: Stimulus Advantage – Stimulus Fails

#### 40 years of econometric data prove that crowd-out swamps stimulus effects

John J. Heim, Ph.D., Political Economy, SUNY Albany, Clinical Professor of Economics and Undergraduate Advisor at Rensselaer, May 2010, Journal of Academy of Business and Economics. 10.3, “Do government deficits crowd out consumer and investment spending?,” p. np

U.S. data for 1960--2000 seems to provide unambiguous support for the notion that crowd out adversely affects investment. Invariably, adding the crowd out variable to otherwise well specified investment functions increased explained variance and resulted in statistically significant T and G variables. For spending on consumer goods, results were more mixed. Adding the deficit variables to otherwise well specified consumption equations significantly increased explained variance, but only provided statistically significant coefficients on the deficit variable(s) about half the time, though there was some indirect evidence that some of these insignificant statistics may be for lack of including changes in the M2 money supply in the years preceding the deficit., thereby providing an offsetting source of funds in the deficit year. 2. One of the most important conclusions is that crowd out appears to completely reduce the positive stimulus effect of spending--generated deficits on the economy, at least in the more sophisticated models tested, though in simpler models it only partially eliminate the stimulus effect. On the other hand, deficit-creating tax cuts actually have a negative effect on the economy in virtually all models tested, contrary to standard Keynesian theory. It is virtually impossible to get the negative sign on the tax variable Keynesian IS theory requires when testing econometrically, apparently because the negative effects of crowd out on private spending (out of borrowed money) swamp the stimulus effect of the tax cut.

#### Evidence that the stimulus worked are based on a bad research methodology

Ramesh Ponnuru, contributor to TIME and Washington Post, summa cum laude degree in history from Princeton, 3-15-2012, <http://www.kansas.com/2012/03/16/2257221/stimulus-helped-grow-debt-not.html>

Media fact-check organizations have no such doubts. Factcheck.org says it’s “just false” to deny that the stimulus has created jobs. It cites the Congressional Budget Office’s estimate that the stimulus had saved or created millions of jobs. But the CBO, as its director has explained, hasn’t really checked the effect of the stimulus. It has merely reported what the results of additional federal spending and tax credits would be if you assume that spending and tax credits are stimulative. In other words: If you assume that stimulus works, it must have worked. This circularity doesn’t bother PolitiFact, a group that seeks to elevate the tone of our political debates but usually lowers it. Relying on the CBO and other groups that use similar methods, it says people who deny the effectiveness of the stimulus have their “pants on fire.” The Research Last summer, Dylan Matthews reviewed the research on the stimulus for the Washington Post and dug up six studies that found a positive effect. Three of them were based on models that assume the stimulus worked. Three of them were supposedly empirical confirmations of this effect. These three all found that states (or counties) that got more stimulus money had stronger economic performances than places that received less. But nobody denies that the federal government can shift the distribution of economic activity. If Congress were to give me $50 billion, I am sure car dealerships and liquor stores in my area would see an uptick in sales. That doesn’t mean the nation as a whole would come out ahead. (I am willing to go along with the experiment if Congress doubts this.)

### AT: Stimulus Advantage – Stimulus Fails

#### Obama’s stimulus didn’t work

Daniel J. Mitchell, Ph.D. in Economics from George Mason University, 3-20-2012, “An Indictment of Barack Obama’s Economic Record,” <http://finance.townhall.com/columnists/danieljmitchell/2012/03/20/an_indictment_of_barack_obamas_economic_record/page/full/>

\* The unemployment rate is still above 8 percent, even though the White House promised it would drop to about 6 percent today if the stimulus was enacted. \* Several million fewer Americans have jobs today than five years ago. \* The poverty rate has jumped to more than 15 percent, with a record number of Americans living below the poverty level of income. \* According to the most recent data, median household income is lower than when the recession began. \* The burden of government spending remains high, and record levels of red ink are a symptom of that bloat in Washington. \* The threat of higher taxes is omnipresent, serving as a Sword of Damocles over the economy’s neck \* Continued weakness in the housing and financial sectors reminds people that bailouts and intervention have left lots of problems unsolved. I also explain that some of the recent good news is in spite of the President’s statist policies. \* The recovery began just as Obama’s stimulus spending ended, thus confirming suspicions that lots of money was wasted as part of a process that hindered the economy’s growth**.**

### AT: Stimulus Advantage – Stimulus Hurts Growth

#### Empirical evidence shows an inverse relationship between spending and growth

Richard W. Rahn, PhD Columbia, 12-19-2011, “RAHN: Government spending jobs myth,” Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/dec/19/government-spending-jobs-myth/>

Government spending grows each year, but what is relevant is whether it is increasing or decreasing as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) and how it relates to the percentage of the adult labor force at work. As can be seen in the accompanying chart, there is an inverse relationship between increasing the size of government and job creation. This empirical evidence, along with much other evidence, is contrary to the argument made by those calling for more government spending to create jobs. Some who argue for more government spending, such as economist Mark Zandi of Merrill Lynch, use neo-Keynesian models to justify their conclusions - conveniently ignoring the fact that such models almost always have been wrong. What also typically is ignored by the neo-Keynesians is that there is an enormous tax extraction cost for the government to obtain each additional dollar. Estimates of this extraction cost typically run from $1.40 to well over $2.50 of lost output for each dollar the government obtains. In addition, there is vast literature showing how specific government spending programs have little or even negative benefit and, as a result, are actually wealth and job destroyers. Thus, the real deadweight loss of additional government taxing and spending is estimated to be in the $3 to $4 range. If additional government spending could create more jobs, it would be expected that over the long run, the socialist or semisocialist economies would have full employment and the smaller-government, developed economies would have higher unemployment. Again, the empirical evidence shows just the opposite. Sweden and Canada are examples of countries that reduced government spending as a percentage of GDP 15 years ago, and as a result, both countries saw increased economic growth and employment.

#### Status quo stimulus will give way to deficit reduction—but increasing deficits any more risks economic chaos

James Bacon, 2-28-2012, “Enjoy 2.4% Economic Growth While You Can. It Won’t Last.,” <http://www.baconsrebellion.com/2012/02/enjoy-2-4-economic-growth-while-you-can-it-wont-last.html>

Both fiscal and monetary policies are unsustainable. The Obama administration sees deficits declining to less than $600 billion yearly later in the decade — a fiscal contraction of $700 billion in a $15 trillion-a-year economy. Republicans would like to cut even more aggressively. Failure to deliver on those deficit cuts would bring a brief reprieve in fiscal stimulus, but bigger deficits would propel Uncle Sam even more rapidly toward the Boomergeddon scenario I have written about. Likewise, Fed policy is not sustainable. Bernanke thinks he can keep interest rates super-low for three years, but that’s only assuming inflation remains tame. If inflation heats up — it’s brushing against 3% right now – bond holders will revolt and demand higher yields to compensate for the eroding value of the dollar, accelerating the nation’s inevitable borrowing crisis. If inflation remains restrained, it will be for one reason only: Pallid economic growth keeps wages and commodity prices depressed. The fact that one of the most stimulative economic policies in the history of the U.S. is yielding a growth rate around a measly 2.4% should be frightening. We’re using up all of our ammo. If the growth rate slows, we’ve got nothing left. We cannot increase fiscal stimulus to $2 trillion a year with collapsing the confidence of the capital markets. And when nominal interest rates are scraping zero, it’s hard to drive them any lower without igniting inflation.

### AT: Stimulus Advantage – Stimulus Hurts Growth

#### Research and empirics prove—stimulus effects are temporary but still create huge amounts of inflation

Otmar Issing, Pres. Financial Studies @ Frankfurt, Spring 2010, The International Economy. 24.2, “Is monetarism dead? Has the resurgence of Keynesianism already peaked?,” p. 35

This dominance of Keynesianism was finally undermined by two developments. The first was new theoretical and empirical research, chiefly associated with the American economist Milton Friedman. The work of those economists, who soon came to be termed "monetarists," called into question fundamental elements of both Keynesian theory and the economic policy it underpinned. Growing skepticism toward Keynesian thinking concerning the effectiveness of fiscal policy and its multiplier effects, the disregard for money and monetary policy, and the hubristic attempt at fine-tuning the economy--was replaced by growing support for monetarism. The second development, just as important, was that Keynesian policy had failed to deliver in practice. No one could have conceded this more plainly than then-British premier James Callaghan in his speech to the Labour Party Conference in Blackpool in September 1976: "We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting Government spending. I tell you, in all candor, that that option no longer exists, and that insofar as it ever did exist, it only worked by injecting bigger doses of inflation into the economy followed by higher levels of unemployment as the next step. That is the history of the past twenty years."

### AT: Launches Advantage – Launches Don’t Hurt Ozone

#### Space launches don’t disrupt the ozone

NASA, 2-24-2008, Federal Government agency dedicated to space policy, “Space Shuttle and International Space Station,” NASA Kennedy Space Center Frequently Asked Questions, http://www.nasa.gov/centers/kennedy/about/information/shuttle\_faq.html

Q. Is it true that launching the Space Shuttle creates a local ozone hole, and that the Space Shuttle releases more chlorine than all industrial uses worldwide? A. No, that is not true. NASA has studied the effects of exhaust from the Space Shuttle's solid rocket motors on the ozone. In a 1990 report to Congress, NASA found that the chlorine released annually in the stratosphere (assuming launches of nine Shuttle missions and six Titan IVs -- which also have solid rocket motors -- per year) would be about 0.25 percent of the total amount of halocarbons released annually worldwide (0.725 kilotons by the Shuttle 300 kilotons from all sources). The report concludes that Space Shuttle launches at the current rate pose no significant threat to the ozone layer and will have no lasting effect on the atmosphere. The exhaust plume from the Shuttle represents a trivial fraction of the atmosphere, and even if ozone destruction occurred within the initial plume, its global impact would be inconsequential.

#### Top scholars agree that there is little risk to the ozone

Martin Ross, PhD from UCLA in Earth and Planetary Sciences, and Paul Zittel, PhD in Physical Chemistory, 6-2000, “Rockets and the Ozone Layer,” AeroSpace, http://www.aero.org/publications/crosslink/summer2000/01.html

RISO represents but one component of ongoing Aerospace activities to provide the Air Force with cutting-edge research and technical guidance on a wide range of environmental issues—from solvent chemistry to toxic ground clouds and ozone depletion. For its part, the RISO team allows SMC to claim world-class scientific expertise with regard to the influence that rocket emissions have on Earth's ozone layer. The advances coming out of RISO are making the Air Force and the entire space-launch community confident that ozone loss from both individual and collective launches does not constitute a significant environmental hazard. RISO has proved that a low-cost program of ongoing plume-wake intercepts using appropriate instrumentation can help resolve the scientific problems surrounding the issue. RISO has also shown how joining forces with other agencies and industry increases the scientific return on investment for all interested parties.

#### If there is a negative effect, it is very minimal

Robert Parson, Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, 10-2010, “Do Space Shuttle Launches Damage the Ozone Layer,” Science and Engineering, http://stason.org/TULARC/science-engineering/ozone-depletion-intro/23-Do-Space-Shuttle-launches-damage-the-ozone-layer.html

23 Do Space Shuttle launches damage the ozone layer? Very little. In the early 1970's, when little was known about the role of chlorine radicals in ozone depletion, it was suggested that HCl from solid rocket motors might have a significant effect upon the ozone layer - if not globally, perhaps in the immediate vicinity of the launch. It was immediately shown that the effect was negligible, and this has been repeatedly demonstrated since. Each shuttle launch produces about 200 metric tons of chlorine as HCl, of which about one-third, or 68 tons, is injected into the stratosphere. Its residence time there is about three years. A full year's schedule of shuttle and solid rocket launches injects 725 tons of chlorine into the stratosphere. This is negligible compared to chlorine emissions in the form of CFC's and related compounds (~1 million tons/yr in the 1980's, of which ~0.3 Mt reach the stratosphere each year). It is also small in comparison to natural sources of stratospheric chlorine, which amount to about 75,000 tons per year. [Prather et al. 1990] [WMO 1991] [Ko et al.]

### AT: Launches Advantage – Ozone Alt-Causes

#### Nitrous oxide collapses the ozone

Peter Spotts, Christian Science Staff, 8-27-2009, “The next major threat to the ozone layer: nitrous oxide,” Christian Science Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2009/0827/the-next-major-threat-to-the-ozone-layer-nitrous-oxide

A colorless, sweet-smelling gas with a long history as a medical and dental anesthetic is the next big threat to Earth's protective ozone layer, according to new research. The culprit: nitrous oxide. Its role in destroying ozone has long been recognized, as well as its role as a heat-trapping greenhouse gas. But the new study puts nitrous oxide's ability to deplete ozone into numbers comparable to those used for other ozone-depleting gases covered by the 1987 Montreal Protocol.

#### Nitrous oxide is as bad as CFCs for the ozone

Peter Spotts, Christian Science Staff, 8-27-2009, “The next major threat to the ozone layer: nitrous oxide,” Christian Science Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2009/0827/the-next-major-threat-to-the-ozone-layer-nitrous-oxide

Nitrous oxide's ozone-depleting clout per pound of gas is comparable to that of a group of chlorine-based gases, HCFCs, that currently are scheduled to be phased out by 2013 under the protocol. And each molecule of nitrous oxide remains in the atmosphere for about 100 years, giving it a lifetime comparable to the compounds covered by the Montreal Protocol. The new study "puts nitrous oxide onto the same playing field" as other ozone-depleting gases, says John Daniel, one of the trio of scientists at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Earth System Research Laboratory that conducted the study. The lab is in Boulder, Colo. The team is reporting its results in Friday's issue of the journal Science.

#### Climate change hurts the ozone layer

Anup Shah, Climate Researcher, 6-8-2002, “The Ozone Layer and Climate Change,” Global Issues, http://www.globalissues.org/article/184/the-ozone-layer-and-climate-change

Scientists believe that Global Warming will lead to a weaker Ozone layer, because as the surface temperature rises, the stratosphere (the Ozone layer being found in the upper part) will get colder, making the natural repairing of the Ozone slower. NASA, for example, reports that by 2030, "climate change may surpass chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) as the main driver of overall ozone loss." The Ozone layer protects all life on Earth from the harmful effects of the Sun's rays. It has been depleting for many years now. Scientists have said that currently over Antarctica the Ozone hole is three times the size of the United States and growing.

### AT: Launches Advantage – SQ Solves Debris

#### The government has been mitigating space debris since the 90’s

Jesusa Cruz, JD from Barry School of Law, 2003, “Wanted: A collective effort towards space debris mitigation,” Panton Law, www.pantonlaw.com/uploads/5/2/6/4/526435/space\_debris\_mitigation.doc+federal+government+space+debris

The government updated its orbital debris report in 1995, issuing the following recommendations: (1) to continue and enhance debris measurement, modeling, and monitoring capabilities; (2) conduct a focused study on debris and emerging low earth orbit (LEO) systems; (3) develop government/industry design guidelines on orbital debris; (4) develop a strategy for international discussion; and (5) review and update U.S. policy on debris. A year after the issuance of this report, President Clinton reaffirmed the earlier policy by calling for U.S. government agencies to minimize space debris. The 1996 policy required NASA, DoD, the intelligence community and the private sector to develop design guidelines for U.S. government space hardware procurements and stressed a United States leadership role in urging other nations to adopt debris mitigation practices and policies.

#### Project ORION just needs funding – it can successfully end space debris problems

Jesusa Cruz, JD from Barry School of Law, 2003, “Wanted: A collective effort towards space debris mitigation,” Panton Law, www.pantonlaw.com/uploads/5/2/6/4/526435/space\_debris\_mitigation.doc+federal+government+space+debris

Although officials criticized the notion of space clean up as “unrealistic,” NASA proposed feasible projects. One of such projects, ORION, would utilize modest-powered laser and earth sensors and the system would detect, track, and eliminate various-sized debris by nudging them out of their present orbit and forcing the debris to re-enter the earth’s atmosphere and harmlessly burn up. No engineering breakthroughs will be needed in completing this project; ORION would integrate current technologies into one system. NASA indicated that after a year of long study, Project ORION appears to be an “inexpensive international solution.” NASA projected that ORION could de-orbit up to 30,000 pieces of debris ranging from one centimeter to ten centimeters in size at below 800 kilometers altitude in two to three years for a total cost of $60 to $70 million. In comparing this estimated cost to the potential loss of a single satellite worth that amount or more, or the price of other mitigation measures such as additional protective shielding, such as expense becomes relatively inexpensive. Once proper funding becomes available, the system could be operational in two years.

#### Obama is already pursuing space-junk clean-up

Rebeccal Boyle, Space Staff Writer, 6-29-2010, “Obama Announces Space Policy: Down With Space Debris, Up With International Cooperation,” Popular Science, http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2010-06/obama-space-policy-short-exploration-details-long-international-cooperation

Cleaning up space junk, conducting climate research and forging international celestial harmony are the hallmarks of President Obama's new National Space Policy (PDF), unveiled Monday. Parts of the plan had been expected for months, but NASA-philes were still holding out hope for a grand vision of human exploration.

### AT: Launches Advantage – Debris Inevitable

#### Even without new launches, space debris would continue to grow

Randolph Schmid, AP Science Writer, 1-19-2006, “Space Debris Accumulating, Report Says,” Space for Peace, http://www.space4peace.org/articles/debris\_accumulating.htm

More than 9,000 pieces of space debris are orbiting the Earth, a hazard that can only be expected to get worse in the next few years. And currently there's no workable and economic way to clean up the mess. The pieces of space junk measuring 4 inches or more total some 5,500 tons, according to a report by NASA scientists J.-C. Liou and N. L. Johnson in Friday's issue of the journal Science. Even if space launches were halted now — which will not happen — the collection of debris would continue growing as items already in orbit collide and break into more pieces, Liou said in a telephone interview.

#### Other nations make space debris inevitable

Randolph Schmid, AP Science Writer, 1-19-2006, “Space Debris Accumulating, Report Says,” Space for Peace, http://www.space4peace.org/articles/debris\_accumulating.htm

Much of the debris results from explosions of satellites, especially old upper stages left in orbit with leftover fuel and high pressure fluids. A 2004 NASA report identified Russia as the source of the largest number of debris items, closely followed by the United States. Other sources were France, China, India, Japan and the European Space Agency. Even without any launches adding to the junk, the creation of new debris from collisions of material already there will exceed the amount of material removed as orbits decay and items fall back to Earth, the researchers estimated.

#### Merely mitigating launches is insufficient to prevent mass space debris

Megan Ansdell, Graduate Student @ GWU, 2010, “Active Space Debris Removal,” Princeton Publications, http://www.princeton.edu/jpia/past-issues-1/2010/Space-Debris-Removal.pdf

Efforts to reduce space debris have focused on mitigation rather than removal. Although mitigation is important, studies show it will be insufﬁcient to stabilize the long-term space debris environment. In this century, increasing collisions between space objects will create debris faster than it is removed naturally by atmospheric drag (Liou and Johnson 2006). Yet, no active space debris removal systems currently exist and there have been no serious attempts to develop them in the past. The limited number of historical impact events fails to give the situation a sense of urgency outside the space debris community. Further, though mitigation techniques are relatively cheap and can be easily integrated into current space activities, active removal will require developing new and potentially expensive systems. The remainder of this paper addresses the current space debris debate and options to develop effective space debris removal systems.

### Solvency – Space Elevator Fails

#### Space elevator is impossible

Jeffrey Kluger, 11-21-2011, “An Elevator to Space?” Time, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2099830,00.html

Some ideas just refuse to go away: trickle-down economics, the bolo tie, couscous. Add to this the space elevator. If you're not familiar with the space elevator, perhaps you've heard it referred to by one of its other names: the bean stalk, the orbital tether, the nonsynchronous orbital skyhook. No? Well never mind, because unlike the bolo tie, it doesn't exist. And unlike the tie too, it probably never will — not in this lifetime at least. But don't tell Google that. The space elevator has been back in the news lately because of tech-world buzz that Google X — the secret Skunk Works where the company that gave us great doodles, a good Web browser and so-so e-mail — has included it on its list of what-if technologies it's trying to help develop. That's cool news, and it made for cool quotes, with the New York Times referring dreamily to Google's "100 shoot-for-the-stars ideas" and the Irish Times predicting confidently that "the space elevator may well replace rockets in 50 years." Maybe, but here's an important hint for aspiring futurists: "within 50 years" is almost always geek-speak for "Like, um, never?" Here's why.

#### Carbon nanotube tech doesn’t actually exist to make the elevator cable

Jeffrey Kluger, 11-21-2011, “An Elevator to Space?” Time, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2099830,00.html

O.K., so step one is building a cable that's 22,238 miles long. Easy enough to imagine — now what's your construction material? Ordinary metals like titanium, steel and aluminum and familiar synthetic fibers like Kevlar and fiberglass are either too heavy or too breakable or both. The solution: carbon nanotubes. (Hint No. 2 for aspiring futurists: carbon nanotubes are the fallback material for nearly anything fanciful that hasn't been invented yet.) Nanotubes are actually quite nifty in principle — molecular strands of carbon molecules arranged in hexagonal configurations that are made up of much more empty space than mass. This makes them incredibly strong and incredibly light, and they've already been manufactured in strands with a length-to-diameter ratio of 132 million to one. That means they're very, very long relative to their girth, so a 22,000-mile (35,400 km) cable should be a snap, right? Well, no. Remember, the girth we're talking about is on the molecular scale. The longest carbon-nanotube fiber ever manufactured is just 8 to 12 in. (20 to 30 cm) long. So we've still got a little knitting to do.

#### Space elevator impossible – physics

Jeffrey Kluger, 11-21-2011, “An Elevator to Space?” Time, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2099830,00.html

Then, of course, there's the physics. There are a whole lot of reasons Newton trumps Google on this one, but let's concentrate just on the Coriolis effect. You know what this is even if you don't, simply because you have an intuitive sense of how the physical world works. In the case of space elevators, the Coriolis effect dictates that an object higher up on the cable will move a whole lot faster than an object that's lower, even if they take exactly the same amount of time to complete a single rotation. Why? Picture a phonograph album. (An album. A phonograph album. Sigh. Google it.) A standard album turns at about 33.3 revolutions per minute, or one revolution per 1.8 seconds. That's true of any point on the album, whether it's near the center or way out at the perimeter. Of course, out at the perimeter of the 16-in. (40 cm) diameter disk, the circumference is much larger — about 50 in. (127 cm) — than it is at a point near the center, where the diameter is, say, 3 in. (7.5 cm) and the circumference is 9.4 in. (24 cm). So the point on the edge must rotate much faster to cover that 50 in. in 1.8 seconds than the point near the center, which has to cover less than a fifth of the distance in the same time. Want proof of the difference in speed? Imagine turning up the record's revolutions per minute to 45, which was the r.p.m. for a single. (A single. Never mind.) Now put a penny somewhere on the label near the center. The album will spin, but the penny won't budge. Move it out to the perimeter, however, and the increased speed will cause the penny to be flung away. Neat, huh — but not so neat when it comes to space elevators. Since the lower regions of the cable are moving slower than the higher ones, a rising car will lag behind the orbiting anchor, causing a drag on the cable that could destabilize the entire assembly. For Newtonian reasons so complex they'd make your head hurt, you can dampen this effect by moving your orbital anchor higher, up to 62,000 miles (100,000 km) above the ground, which puts us a wee bit further still from the 11 in. (28 cm) of nanotube we've got so far.

### Solvency – NASA Fails

#### NASA empirically fails – budget overruns and failure to commercialize.

Edward L. Hudgins, director of The Objectivist Center and editor of the Cato Institute book, Space: The Free-Market Frontier, 1/28/2004, “Move Aside, NASA,” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=2514

But after the triumphs of Apollo, NASA failed to make space more accessible to mankind. There were supposed to be shuttle flights every week; instead, there have been about four per year. The space station was projected to cost $8 billion, house a crew of 12 and be in orbit by the mid-1990s. Instead, its price tag will be $100 billion and it will have only a crew of three. Worse, neither the station nor the shuttle does much important science. Governments simply cannot provide commercial goods and services. Only private entrepreneurs can improve quality, bring down the prices, and make accessible to all individuals cars, airline trips, computers, the Internet, you name it. Thus, to avoid the errors of the shuttle and space station, NASA's mission must be very narrowly focused on exploring the moon and planets, and perhaps conducting some basic research, which also might serve a defense function. This will mean leaving low Earth orbit to the private sector.

#### Track record proves – NASA not able to accomplish exploration goals.

Joseph N. Pelton, Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington University, May 2010, “A new space vision for NASA—And for space entrepreneurs too?” Space Policy, p.79

One might think that, since Muskwas seeking to develop his own launch capability, he was exaggerating; but a review of the record suggests otherwise. Today nearly 25 years after the Rogers and Paine Commission reports that followed the Challenger disaster, we find that the recommendations for NASA to develop a reliable and costeffective vehicle to replace the Shuttle is somewhere between being a disappointment and a fiasco. Billions of dollars have gone into various spaceplane and reusable launch vehicle developments by NASA over the past 20 years. Spaceplane projects have been started by NASA time and again amid great fanfare and major expectations and then a few years later either cancelled in failure or closed out with a whimper. The programs that NASA has given up on now include the Delta Clipper, the HL-20, X-33, the X-34, X-37, X-38, and X-43 after billions of US funds and billions more of private money have been sacrificed to the cause.

#### Budget battles make NASA exploration unsustainable.

Edward Isarevich, Principal at ETA Consulting, 7/25/2008, “The Real Cost of Space Exploration,” http://knol.google.com/k/the-real-cost-of-space-exploration#

Ever since Apollo 11's landing on the moon, the government's interest in space started to decline. Did we win the space race or did we uselessly spend billions of dollars? It is doubtful if anyone will ever have a clear answer to this question. NASA's ambitious lunar plans became bogged down in the incoherence of the annual funding battles in Congress. A few more Apollos were indeed completed but the ideas to pursue numerous scientific experiments on the moon got "lost in space." The moon base and space station projects were completely abandoned to the next generation of space explorers. Not until the Bush administration were they touched upon once again. President Bush proposed to undertake a large project that would involve the construction of both a moon base and a space station that would mainly serve as assembly, test, and departure points for piloted missions to Mars and beyond. However, estimates nearing $300 billion made it obvious why this ambitious idea was never mentioned in Congress. History clearly shows, tells us Robert A. Frosch, former NASA Administrator, that "society gets its money back from science programs, but not immediately. That's why science programs can be tough to sell to political people, who aren't terribly interested in what's going to happen 10 or 15 years from now."

### Politics Link – Plan Costs Political Capital

#### Noone supports the plan – drains political capital.

Craig Nelson, author and former editor at Harper Collins, 2/11/2010, “America’s Long Journey Away From the Moon and Mars,” Wall Street Journal, http://blogs.wsj.com/speakeasy/2010/02/11/americas-long-journey-away-from-the-moon-and-mars/

Though congressmen from Texas, Florida, Alabama and California would like to believe otherwise, space travel today lacks political capital. Lyndon Johnson said that he refused to cut NASA’s budget in order to reach John Kennedy’s “within this decade” target as part of tending to the slain president’s legacy. But Congress and most of the American public in the 1960s fundamentally supported going to the Moon as a crucial element of national defense. Just as Obama’s announced budget freeze omits the Pentagon, so did NASA stay fully supported forty years ago, even with federal deficits rising in the wake of Vietnam and the Great Society. At its Apollo peak of funding in 1966, the agency held 5.5% of the federal budget. In 2009, it corralled .55%. In 2008 and 2009, meanwhile, the $200 billion cost of going to the Moon, adjusted for inflation, was spent in 540 days on the Iraq War.

#### Space drains political capital and presidential focus.

Dwayne A. Day, historian, 6/28/2004, “Lost in space: Bill Clinton’s memoirs and the non-importance of space,” Space Review, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/171/1

Clinton’s lack of attention to space in his memoir is not surprising or unusual. Presidents, by the nature of their job, cannot spend much time, energy, or political capital on space issues. Even if they were inclined to do so—and they are not—they have too many other demands on their time. NASA’s budget is less than one percent of the federal budget and gets about the same amount of presidential attention. Dwight Eisenhower devoted about a dozen pages of his memoir, Waging Peace, to discussing Sputnik and NASA. Lyndon Johnson spent ten pages of his memoir, The Vantage Point, discussing space during his senatorial, vice presidential and presidential terms. Richard Nixon devoted only two pages of his memoirs to discussing Apollo 11 and NASA. The downward trend continued for other presidential memoirs. Space is nowhere near as important today as it was during the Cold War.

#### New space priorities cause Congressional battle.

Rikki Klaus, Reporter, 2/16/2011, “Former NASA Advisor Says Fight Is Brewing Over 2012 Budget,” WHNT News, http://www.whnt.com/news/huntsvilleandmadisoncounty/whnt-former-nasa-advisor-says-fight-is-brewing-over-2012-budget-20110216,0,69849.story

Huntsville attorney Mark McDaniel, who has advised presidents, NASA administrators and Congress on space policy, says a fight for NASA's future is about to lift off. "What's gearing up right now is a space policy fight again, just like we had last year," he predicted. McDaniel says President Obama's nearly 19 billion dollar budget may not be NASA's roadmap to the future. "The president can propose a budget all day long, but the Congress has to dispose. Congress has to fund it," pointed out McDaniel. Generally speaking, McDaniel said the president sets space policy. But last year, it was members of Congress who did it, an unprecedented move on their part.

### Elections Link – Plan Unpopular With Public

#### Plan is unpopular – even if the public supports space, they don’t support funding it.

P. Ehrenfreund, Space Policy Institute, et al, August-September 2010, “Building long-term constituencies for space exploration,” Acta Astronautica, p.503

Today, governments and societies consider environment, the economy, the fast growing population and climate change as higher priorities than human activities in Low Earth Orbit(LEO) and the exploration of the solar system. This is due to the evolution of perception from a ‘‘need to know’’ to a ‘‘nice to know’’ approach, as well as the necessity to have standard observations of our home planet to monitor its changes. Space probes and satellites are launched all over the world nearly every week but their purpose is often obscure and they remain far removed from the public’s everyday consciousness [2]. In particular, the younger generation (between18and 25), as evidenced from recent US marketing studies, is least interested in space endeavors [3]. The lack of support from the public for space programs is a complex issue. Despite many efforts and initiatives in the 21st century of NASA’s previous Office of Communication Planning (OCP),public information policy surveys, marketing and advertising studies [4] resulted in similar conclusions concerning the public awareness of space activities [5–7]. An important finding is that the part of society that supports the space program and believes that space exploration is a noble endeavor does not necessarily agree that governments should allocate substantial financial resources to achieve those exciting space missions [8]. Even during the Apollo era, polls showed that the public did not approve the large governmental spending [1]. A survey in Europe in 2007 showed that space activities are perceived risky, expensive and not very useful by a large part of the population [9]. The recent survey on space activities of the European Union (EU) in July 2009 conducted by Gallup showed that a majority of 63% of EU citizens regards European space activities as important in the EU framework [10]. However, a majority is either against or not sure if the EU should invest more in space exploration.

#### Public opposes spending on space– and no depth among supporters.

James A. Vedda, Senior Policy Analyst, Center for Space Policy & Strategy, 9/18/2007, “Humans to Mars: Logical Step or Dangerous Distraction?” http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/372849main\_Vedda%20-%20AIAA%202007.pdf

Concerns about public opinion may become problematic even before young voters mature. A recent Harris poll on fixing the U.S. budget deficit held another ominous message for space exploration, with the potential for negative consequences in the near term. Among the questions in the March 2007 poll, respondents were asked to pick two federal programs (from a list of 12) that should be cut to reduce government spending. The space program was chosen by 51% of respondents, topping the list by a wide margin (13 percentage points above the second choice).44 This result indicates that approximately half of the U.S. voting-age population views the civil space program as either a waste of resources or simply a non-essential activity. If other polling results, such as the Gallup surveys discussed earlier, accurately portray two-thirds of the population as supporters of space exploration, then a significant percentage of those supporters see the space program as a luxury item that could be sacrificed in a constrained budget environment.

#### No public support for NASA – shuttle disasters.

Peja Bulatovic, CBC News, 1/28/2011, “NASA struggles with direction 25 years after Challenger disaster,” CBC News, http://license.icopyright.net/user/viewFreeUse.act?fuid=MTI2MzM2NDA%3D

The explosion of the shuttle in 1986 destroyed the lives of the victims and their families, but also factored into a drastic change in public and government opinion towards NASA and space flight in general. The highly publicized mission was Challenger's 10th launch. The team included Christa McAuliffe, a teacher who was selected to be the first civilian in space, in addition to six NASA crew members. "Back then, the attitude was the shuttle can't blow up - nobody thought of space flight as dangerous," recalled Pat Duggins, author of Trailblazing Mars: NASA's Next Giant Leap. A similar disaster involving the shuttle Columbia in 2003, compounded by a sluggish U.S. economy, has drastically reduced government and public support for funding the program, says Duggins. But he maintains that the space industry will continue to move forward.

### Private CP Solves – General

#### Space elevator can be built by anyone – just a question of funding

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 2006, Leaving the Planet by Space Elevator, p. 161-2

The cost of implementation, at around $10 Billion to $20 Billion is within reach of dozens of countries, Fortune 50 corporations and even wealthy individuals. Once a determined country or entity decides to go ahead with implementing the technology and building the first Space Elevator, it would be difficult to stop it. The first country or entity to successfully implement the technology will quickly gain economic and political power in the form of controlling the primary access to space: telecommunications, energy, the moon, Mars, asteroids and a myriad of new markets. This will drive the history of the 21 ‘ century.

#### The private sector solves space better than NASA

James Burk, VP of Artemis Society Int’l, 6-3-2004, “What the Moon-Mars Commission’s Report Should Say,” Mars News, http://www.marsnews.com/articles/20040603-what\_the\_moonmars\_commissions\_report\_should\_say.html

For too long, NASA has stifled creativity and entrepreneurialism on the part of non-governmental efforts to pioneer space. In the late 1990s, many firms such as Rotary Rocket and Beal Aerospace were working on bringing SSTO/RLV technologies to market, and NASA did everything to prevent their success. Firms like LunaCorp and TransOrbital were talking about private lunar missions and NASA did everything to stifle them, including spreading rumors of a new NASA moon probe, which ultimately amounted to nothing and caused their funding opportunities to dry up. Let the commercial sector do what it excels at, namely cutting through bureaucracy and accomplishing goals on a short timeframe. Instead of stifling private sector efforts, NASA should do everything they can to help them. NASA should enhance and expand their programs to transfer technologies & methods developed internally to start-up companies. During the Apollo days, most of the hardware and operations were conducted by private contractors. That model has worked before and should be returned to for future projects. Let NASA set the direction & goals, but let the private sector implement them and create wealth & commercial opportunities from them. That is a much faster way to get into space, and also much cheaper for the public.

#### Private development key to innovation and technology development – solves your inspiration arguments.

Joseph N. Pelton, Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington University, May 2010, “A new space vision for NASA—And for space entrepreneurs too?” Space Policy, p.78

XPrize Founder Peter Diamandis has noted that we don't have governments operating taxi companies, building computers, or running airlines-and this is for a very good reason. Commercial organizations are, on balance, better managed, more agile, more innovative, and more market responsive than government agencies. People as diverse as movie maker James Cameron and Peter Diamandis feel that the best way forward is to let space entrepreneurs play a greater role in space development and innovation. Cameron strongly endorsed a greater role for commercial creativity in U.S. space programs in a February 2010 Washington Post article and explained why he felt this was the best way forward in humanity's greatest adventure: “I applaud President Obama's bold decision for NASA to focus on building a space exploration program that can drive innovation and provide inspiration to the world. This is the path that can make our dreams in space a reality”

### Private CP Solves – Tax Incentives

#### Incentives can spur investment in space and avoids political opposition to spending on NASA.

Leroy Baker, Tax-News.com, 8/19/2010, “Tax Breaks to Boost Private Space Exploration,” http://www.usa-tax-news.com/story/Tax\_Breaks\_To\_Boost\_Private\_Space\_Exploration\_\_\_\_44876.html

United States Senator Bill Nelson has announced legislation that would offer major tax and other incentives to encourage growth in the private space exploration industry. Nelson's plan would create up to five regional business enterprise zones around the country as "magnets for commercial space ventures." As it grapples with record federal deficits, the Obama administration no longer perceives the funding of space exploration a priority and is cancelling the space shuttle program. One more shuttle flight is scheduled for next year after the Senate approved a bill to provide additional funding to the program, but a cloud of uncertainty currently hangs over the US space industry, not to mention the hundreds of high technology firms supplying equipment to the US space program. Nelson's bill, known as the Commercial Space Jobs and Investment Act of 2010 would create a new 'commercial space capital formation credit' allowing investors to claim a tax credit worth 20% of their equity investment in a business producing equipment such as launch vehicles and re-entry vehicles. The equity investment would have to be held for a minimum of five years for the investor to qualify for the tax credit.

#### Tax incentives solve – boost private investment and doesn’t link to our budget DA.

Edward Aldridge Jr. et al, Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, at the Department of Defense, June 2004, “A Journey to Inspire, Innovate, and Discover,” Report of the President’s Commission on Implementation of United States Space Exploration Policy, http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/60736main\_M2M\_report\_small.pdf

Tax Incentives. A time-honored way for government to encourage desired behavior is through the creation of incentives in the tax laws. In this case, an increase in private sector involvement in space can be stimulated through the provision of tax incentives to companies that desire to invest in space or space technology. As an example, the tax law could be changed to make profits from space investment tax free until they reach some pre-determined multiple (e.g., five times) of the original amount of the investment. A historical precedent to such an effort was the use of federal airmail subsidies to help create a private airline industry before World War II. In a like manner, corporate taxes could be credited or expenses deducted for the creation of a private space transportation system, each tax incentive keyed to a specific technical milestone. Creation of tax incentives can potentially create large amounts of investment and hence, technical progress, all at very little expense or risk to the government.

### Private CP Solves – Tax Incentives

#### Private enterprise solves – market barriers won’t prevent

Naveen Jain, chief executive officer and co-founder of Intelius, 4/20/2011, “Our Sputnik Moment: US Entrepreneurs Needed for the "Space Race”,” TFD News, http://www.tfdnews.com/news/2011/04/20/93401-naveen-jain-our-sputnik-moment-us-entrepreneurs-needed-for-space-race.htm

To re-launch our space program, we need private enterprise to step into the void. Government funding only needs to take us to the point where the technology has been developed to get us to the Moon -- and we already have that. It's a model that's been used successfully in the past: the military first developed the Internet, and private enterprise then seized on its commercial potential; the same thing occurred with GPS technology. Naturally, there are barriers to entrepreneurs leading the charge to the Moon. For one thing, ownership is always a point of discussion -- but the fact is that "everyone" and "no one" owns the Moon. Much like when mining resources from international waters (as in fishing), entrepreneurs would need to respect the rights of other business and government players. There is legal precedent for explorers finding and keeping resources that they have uncovered via private investment. There's also the question of whether we can transport resources from the Moon in a cost-effective manner. Perhaps the cost of rocket launches -- by far the greatest expense for a Moon mission -- will come down as more entrepreneurs move into this market, or new technology will make them cheaper. It's even possible to create rocket fuel from resources on the Moon, which would slash return costs and even lower launch costs from Earth. On the other hand, mining and transporting these resources back to the Earth could depress prices as supplies grow, making such ventures less appealing to entrepreneurs. As with all private market endeavors, many will want to take a wait-and-see approach to the Moon's market potential. But therein lies the opportunity for early movers who apply entrepreneurship to the opening of whole new markets, and in the case of the Moon, a whole new world.

### Japan CP Solves

#### Japan can solve the space elevator – key to their leadership

Colony Worlds, 10-7-2008, “Awesome: Japan May Commit $10 Billion Towards Space Elevator,” http://www.colonyworlds.com/2008/10/awesome-japan-may-commit-10-billion-towards-space-elevator.html

With both the US and China relying upon rockets to secure their solar future beyond the heavens, it looks as if the nation of the rising sun is placing its bets on the space elevator. (RIA Novosti) Japanese engineers intend to build an elevator to deliver cargo into space. Japanese authorities are prepared to allocate $10 billion for the project. The space elevator is expected to cut the cost of delivering cargo into space and is considered one of the most ambitious projects of the 21st century. The Japanese plan to unveil a schedule for the elevator’s assembly and commissioning this November. While the space elevator has its share of engineering problems, its successful construction would pretty much guarentee Japan’s space dominance over its rivals, as Japan would be able to launch cargo at much lower prices than either China or the US could via rockets. A space elevator would enable Japan to establish large colonies fairly quickly on both the Moon and Mars–not to mention help the nation generate billions of Yen by renting it out to half the planet. Note: The first Japanese Space Elevator conference is coming up, so be sure to check out the Space Elevator Blog for highlights from Tokyo!

#### Japanese companies have the expertise

Jamie Condliffe, 2-22-2012, “Japan Will Have A Space Elevator by 2050,” Gizmodo, http://gizmodo.com/5887210/japan-will-have-a-space-elevator-by-2050

It might the stuff of science fiction dreams, but a Japanese construction company has announced that it will have built a working space elevator by 2050. Where can I join the queue? According to the The Daily Yomiuri, construction company Obayashi Corp has announced it will have built a space elevator capable of shuttling passengers 36,000 kilometers above the Earth by 2050. The company plans to use carbon nanontubes, which are 20 times stronger than steel, to produce the cables required for the elevator. Those cables will be stretched to a counterweight 96,000 kilometers above our planet, about one-fourth of the distance between the Earth and the moon. The terminal station, 36,000 kilometers above Earth, will be reached by cars that can carry 30 people and travel at 200 kilometers per hour. An Obayashi official said: "At this moment, we cannot estimate the cost for the project. However, we'll try to make steady progress so that it won't end just up as simply a dream."

#### Japan can do it

Tim Hornyak, CNET, 2-23-2012, “Japan plans snail-paced space elevator for 2050,” http://news.cnet.com/8301-17938\_105-57383872-1/japan-plans-snail-paced-space-elevator-for-2050/

Japanese construction company Obayashi wants to build an elevator to space and transport passengers to a station about a tenth the distance to the moon. The elevator would use super-strong carbon nanotubes in its cables and could be ready as early as 2050, according to Tokyo-based Obayashi. The cables would stretch some 60,000 miles, about a quarter the distance to the moon, and would be attached to Earth at a spaceport anchored to the ocean floor. The other end would dangle a counterweight in space. The elevator would zip along at 125 mph, possibly powered by magnetic linear motors, but would take about a week to get to the station. It would carry up to 30 people.

## Light Rail Neg

### AT: Inherency – Frontline

#### Massive funding for rail now – includes mass alternative energy investments – should have solved the environmental benefits of the aff already.

House Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight Hearing :"Impact of Tax Policies on the Commercial Application of Renewable Energy Technology."[9]. (2012, April). Congressional Documents and Publications. http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/HHRG-112-SY21-WState-MThorning-20120419.pdf

In recent decades, legislation has been enacted at the federal, state and local level to promote the development and deployment of renewable energy, greater fuel economy for transportation vehicles, alternative vehicles and high speed rail. n7 For example, the Energy Policy Act of 1992 initiated the renewable energy production tax credit (PTC), an inflation-adjusted tax credit for electricity produced from qualifying renewable energy sources or technologies. As mentioned above, the Recovery Act extended and amended the PTC and provided additional options including energy investment tax credits and grants. Most states and some localities have also have also enacted renewable portfolio standards or goals and have provided subsidies including grants, rebates and tax credits for the installation of renewable energy. In the mid 1975's, in response to the Arab oil embargo, Congress enacted Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards to improve the average fuel economy of light cars and trucks. In 2011, new CAFE standards for cars and trucks were set to further improve fuel economy. n8 There has also been substantial government support for alternative fuel vehicles, including hydrogen and electric powered vehicles as well as for biofuel in recent years. n9

#### High speed rail grants already exist – many trains being built now and globally.

Michael Grunwald, Staff Writer for TIME, “No high speed rail funds for two states that don’t want it”, 12-9-2010, Time US, http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2036197,00.html

Obama launched the national high-speed rail program with $8 billion in his stimulus bill, plus another $2.5 billion in last year's budget. The idea is to upgrade America's woeful passenger rail network with sleek new bullet trains — starting with a line between Tampa and Orlando and another between San Francisco and Los Angeles — as well as faster Amtrak service on existing lines. Trains topping 200 miles per hour are common in Europe and Asia, and are now under construction in countries like Brazil and Saudi Arabia. (See photos of China's high-speed rail.)

#### California is pushing ahead – despite lack of fed backing and despite the economy.

Spencer Michels, PBS, “California Grapples with High-Speed Rail Debate”, 3-1-2012, Transportation Publication, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2012/03/high-speed-rail-battle-in-california.html

California voters decided in 2008 to go for high-speed rail, passing a $9 billion bond issue to pay for the beginnings of a system that would connect San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Sacramento with trains that would speed along at 220 miles an hour. The estimated cost of this system started out around $33 billion, but skyrocketed to somewhere near $100 billion today -- a figure the governor says he can reduce. The plan was to start laying rail in the rural Central Valley, and eventually connect the big cities. But times have changed for the worse. The price tag and the economy -- plus plans to start in the center of the state rather than in the cities -- have soured many Californians on the whole project. A recent Field Poll shows that two-thirds of voters would like another chance to vote, and most of them would vote against it. Still, Governor Brown is pushing ahead, confident that private enterprise will supply most of the money for the train, together with $3.5 billion the federal government has put up under the stimulus package. He says he's aware that there are those who want to "shrink back from such a strenuous undertaking." But, he continues, "If you believe that California will continue to grow, as I do, and that millions more people will be living in our state, this is a wise investment."

### AT: Solvency – Frontline

#### Nobody will ride the rain – Ridership claims are overstated to a tune of 100%.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Costs and Ridership. Proponents of high-speed rail projects tend to overstate their benefits and understate their costs. Danish planning professor Bent Flyvbjerg has studied hundreds of government megaprojects, and he argues that project supporters suffer from "optimism bias" regarding the merits of projects, and that they often "strategically misrepresent" project details in order to gain support. No high-speed rail line has been built from scratch in the United States. But historically, urban passenger rail projects have, on average, gone 40 percent over their projected costs. At the same time, U.S. passenger rail planners typically overestimate ridership by an average of about 100 percent. California's high-speed rail authority is projecting that the San Francisco to Los Angeles line will be carrying two to three times more passengers by 2020 than Amtrak's entire Boston to Washington corridor currently carries. A Reason Foundation review of the state rail authority's plan called the ridership projections "the most unrealistic projections produced for a major transport project anywhere in the world." A report on the California project from the state's Senate Transportation Committee pointed to many major risks of the project, including inaccurate forecasting, uncertainly regarding rights-of-way, and substantial safety issues. Unlike running a bus system or even an airline, building a rail line requires accurate long-range forecasting. Planning and construction can take many years, and the service life of rail lines is measured in decades. A seemingly minor forecasting error—or a deliberately optimistic estimate—can turn what appears to be a sound investment into an expensive white elephant.

#### Be skeptical of their studies – they suffer from optimism bias.

Elizabeth Deakin. Prof of City and Regional Planning @ UC Berkeley. December 2010. “Environmental and Other Co-Benefits of Developing a High Speed Rail System in California: A Prospective Vision for 2010-2050.” UCB Center for Environmental Public Policy. <http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/highspeedrail/HSR10_Deakin.pdf>.

More generally, many analysts have characterized the California HSR project as a "megaproject" - one whose complexity, time frame, large size, and huge cost lead to risks of optimism bias (overconfidence, unduly favorable interpretations of evidence) and strategic misrepresentation (strategic misrepresentation, or lying) (Pickrell, 1992, Flybjerg et al, 2003, Altshuler and Luberoff, 2003.) The increases in costs over time have been one source of concern, but an even bigger source of concern appears to be the major increases in forecast ridership between 2000 and 2007. Forecasts prepared by Charles River Associates in 2007 estimated that the "investment grade" ridership would be about 37.9 million riders a year in 2020; their sensitivity analysis suggested a high ridership of up to 69.1 million riders annually. Forecast prepared seven years later by Cambridge Systematics for 2030 projected a much higher 65.5 million riders in the " base case" and up to 96.5 million riders for the high estimate. CHSRA has cited ridership figures even higher than this latter high estimate and apparently has calculated environmental benefits on the basis of the high estimate. (www.highspeedrail.ca.gov). Reviewers have questioned the methods used in the latter studies, although the consultants and agency dispute the criticisms (www.highspeedrail.ca.gov: Ridership\_and\_Revenue\_Forecasting\_Study.)

### AT: Solvency – Frontline

#### Supply, technology, and policy all alter how solvent the plan is – predictions on these are \*very difficult\* to make.

Elizabeth Deakin. Prof of City and Regional Planning @ UC Berkeley. December 2010. “Environmental and Other Co-Benefits of Developing a High Speed Rail System in California: A Prospective Vision for 2010-2050.” UCB Center for Environmental Public Policy. <http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/highspeedrail/HSR10_Deakin.pdf>.

One area of considerable complexity in evaluating the environmental benefits is the comparison to other alternatives. For HSR, comparative environmental costs and savings depend on what is assumed to be happening in air and highway transport (the competition.) What do we compare? Supply (capacity), technology, and policy are three factors that could affect the forecasts; some options are: HSR construction compared to new construction of equivalent capacity for air and highway travel, e.g., widened roadways, more flights, more runways, assumed to be needed to handle growth Effects of additional use of air and auto modes with little or no capacity expansion or technological change (and resulting congestion, emissions, etc.) Use of technologically advanced air and auto modes in the future, e.g., advanced highway operations, highly efficient motor vehicle technologies, quiet and fuel efficient aircraft, more effective air traffic control Continuation of current subsidies and services, e.g., subsidies to minor airports, subsidies to transit services that feed HSR stations Continued cuts in subsidies, up to eventual elimination of support for minor airports and for public transit. Each of these options or a combination of them could be used to forecast how HSR would fare, with widely different results likely. Figuring out "most likely' trajectories is not a simple matter, because existing plans only help a little – for the most part there is not enough detail., and assumptions and time horizons differ. Scenarios thus may be the best way to proceed.

### AT: Solvency – Alt Causes – 2NC/1NR

#### Market access determines saliency of the plan.

Elizabeth Deakin. Prof of City and Regional Planning @ UC Berkeley. December 2010. “Environmental and Other Co-Benefits of Developing a High Speed Rail System in California: A Prospective Vision for 2010-2050.” UCB Center for Environmental Public Policy. <http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/highspeedrail/HSR10_Deakin.pdf>.

But how realistic are such concepts? The designs reflect possibilities for development that have not been checked against market realities. With a high unemployment rate, a flattened real estate market, and heavy current reliance on the automobile for nearly all travel, Fresno is not a particularly god prospect for new infill development any time soon. More generally, rail in such areas tends to be served by park and ride lots and used by travelers who arrive by car from distant locales. Might HSR actually promote more sprawl and long distance travel, especially long distance commuting? This question not only is important if we are to understand the impacts of HSR on California, it is also squarely within the set of questions SB375, the state's law to reduce greenhouse gases by curbing sprawl, must address. SB375 plans ('sustainable community strategies") are to increase infill around transit, and HSR multimodalstations could certainly be hubs for such development. However, it won't happen unless there is a market for it.

#### Specific alignment and elevation design determine saliency of the plan.

Elizabeth Deakin. Prof of City and Regional Planning @ UC Berkeley. December 2010. “Environmental and Other Co-Benefits of Developing a High Speed Rail System in California: A Prospective Vision for 2010-2050.” UCB Center for Environmental Public Policy. <http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/highspeedrail/HSR10_Deakin.pdf>.

Many impacts of HSR will depend on the specific alignment and elevation design decisions being developed now. Mitigation of these impacts will likely add costs to the project. An analysis of HSR's changing impacts over time (including a life cycle analysis)is worth doing, but the comparison to other modes likewise should include life cycle comparisons. Urban impacts will depend not only on HSR plans but also on state and local actions that shape the context in which HSR will operate. If the next 10-12 million people and their jobs are located mostly in low density developments at the fringe of metropolitan areas, it seems likely that driving will continue to be the best option for many trips in the HSR range. If population and economic growth is accommodated around transit lines through urban infill and densification, HSR may be easily accessible to a higher share of the population and employment centers and therefore more attractive. California's new initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases through regional and local planning under SB375 could spur the latter response.

### AT: Solvency – Alt-Causes – 2NC/1NR

#### Optimism bias cripples any hope of solvency.

Elizabeth Deakin. Prof of City and Regional Planning @ UC Berkeley. December 2010. “Environmental and Other Co-Benefits of Developing a High Speed Rail System in California: A Prospective Vision for 2010-2050.” UCB Center for Environmental Public Policy. <http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/highspeedrail/HSR10_Deakin.pdf>.

Why is this the accuracy of costs and forecasts an environmental issue? Largely, this is because some environmental impacts are a function of costs and ridership. For example, if construction cost overruns are severe, funds that might otherwise have been spent on environmental mitigation or amenities may be reduced. Likewise, if ridership falls short, both positive and negative impacts may fall short of those anticipated. Indeed, in considering environmental impacts, it is useful to distinguish those that result from right of way and design choices, from those that are a function of operations, from those that are a function of demand. Many environmental costs result from building the system, whether or not there is good ridership: takings, severance, circuitry, impacts on parks, farmland, visual impact. Others are a function of the number of trains operating regardless of how many passengers are on it, e.g. noise, vibrations, and a significant portion of energy consumption and emissions. Still other environmental costs are a direct function of ridership. Examples include the traffic levels that will be experienced in station areas, and the potential for business growth related to passenger services. With some analysts (Levinson, Reason) claiming that ridership could be closer to 20 million a year in 2030 than the currently projected 100 million, worries that forecasts are drastically too high could have significant environmental consequences in addition to the cost consequences. An accurate benefits assessment, including environmental assessment, rests in part on the accuracy of the demand forecasts**.**

### AT: Solvency – AT: Country Models

#### Comparative models don’t assume US downtown centers – in the context of the US, this will decrease passenger ridership.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Importance of Downtowns. The assumption that people will want to go where new high-speed train lines would go is a big risk. New rail lines would likely go from downtown to downtown, but downtowns have been losing their importance as job centers for decades. While many people travel between, say, the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas, that does not mean that they travel between downtowns, which will be the primary points served by rail. Jobs and people are spread throughout modern cities in a fine-grained pattern. As economist William Bogart observes, only about 10 to 15 percent of metropolitan jobs are located in central city downtowns—in Los Angeles it is less than 5 percent. Even when suburban downtowns are counted—only a small fraction of which would be served by high-speed rail—the total is still only 30 to 40 percent. That means that most people won't find high-speed rail convenient for business travel.

#### Europe proves that high speed rail suffering from spending creep, is not utilized, and trades off with freight shipping – which should be on the rails, not passengers.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Rail's declining importance in Europe has come about despite onerous taxes on driving. Much of the revenue from those taxes is effectively used to provide large subsidies to rail. French economist Rémy Prud'Homme estimates that taxpayers "pay about half the total cost of providing the service." And because of the limited ridership on high-speed rail, it has done little to relieve highway congestion. "Not a single high-speed track built to date has had any perceptible impact on the road traffic carried by parallel motorways," says Ari Vatanen, a member of the European Parliament, in his summary of a 2005 conference on European transport. Europe's passenger-travel mix is similar to that of the United States. The big difference is that European intercity rail carries a 5.8 percent share of the travel market compared with Amtrak's 0.1 percent. The massive subsidies Europe pours into high-speed rail may not even explain this difference, given that the European percentage is steadily declining despite those subsidies. Instead, the answer may be that Europe's lower incomes and high taxes on autos and fuel have simply slowed the growth of driving. European planners predict that rail and bus's combined share will continue to decline. As in Japan, Europe's emphasis on passenger rail has had a profound effect on freight rail. While a little more than one-fourth of American freight goes on the highway and more than a third goes by rail, nearly three-fourths of European freight goes on the road and just a sixth goes by rail. Moreover, rail's share of freight movement is declining in Europe—it was 22 percent in 1980—but it increased in the United States from 27 percent in 1980 to 39 percent in 2007. Rail's low share in carrying freight in both Japan and Europe suggests that the Obama administration's hope of getting both people and freight off the highways and onto trains may a pipedream: a country or region can apparently use its rail system for passengers or freight, but not both. The fact that American freight railroads are profitable while European passenger lines are not suggests that freight, not passengers, is the highest and best use of a railroad system in most places. Thus, a government initiative to spend tens of billions of dollars on passenger rail in the United States might get a small percentage of cars off the road, but a consequence may be to increase the number of trucks on the road.

### AT: Solvency – AT: Country Models

#### Japan proves few people utilize high speed rail, it swells the deficit, and that highway systems have been more effective.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Probably no country in the world is better suited to high-speed rail than Japan. From Greater Tokyo, one of the world's largest and densest metropolitan areas, rail lines travel to chains of other large, dense cities typically located 25 to 50 miles apart. As of 1949, most rail lines in Japan were owned by Japanese National Railways (JNR), a government corporation. Although nationalized, JNR was not subsidized and had earned a profit, or at least broken even, every year until it began building high-speed rail lines. As of 1960, Japanese rail lines carried conventional trains at conventional speeds. In that year, autos accounted for just 5 percent of Japanese travel, while rails carried 77 percent. Then construction began on the Shinkansen, the world's first high-speed rail system. The first bullet train between Tokyo and Osaka proved highly profitable, and it has carried more people than all other high-speed rail trains in the world combined. Once this line was built, however, Japanese politicians demanded bullet trains for their own cities and prefectures. With one exception, all lines built since the first one have lost money. Japan's experience shows that once a nation starts building high-speed rail, political forces make it hard to stop. Despite the need for huge subsidies that Japan cannot afford, the nation's taxpayers are forced to pay for high-speed lines into the prefectures of every powerful politician in the country. These and other political factors have driven up bullet train costs, and caused Japanese National Railways to switch from a profit-making venture, before 1964, to a money loser ever since. JNR raised passenger fares, but that only pushed more people off the trains and into automobiles. Total automobile travel surpassed rail travel in 1977 and has kept on growing. Between 1965 and 2005, per capita driving increased by more than 900 percent, while per capita rail travel increased only 19 percent. By 1987, expansion of bullet-train services and other below-cost operations had swelled JNR's debt to more than $350 billion. That high debt load led to a financial crisis, which significantly contributed to the nation's economic woes of the last two decades. The government was forced to absorb JNR's debt and privatize the railways. As of 2007, rail's share of Japanese passenger travel had declined to 29 percent, which may still be more than in any other country in the world. And the average Japanese person travels about 1,950 miles per year by train, which is definitely more than people in any other country. But only about 20 percent of those rail miles are by high-speed rail. Automobiles carry 60 percent of passenger travel, and the remainder is divided between bus and domestic air. After adjusting for inflation, Japan has spent about the same amount of money per capita on high-speed rail as the United States has spent on the interstate highway system. Yet the returns to Japan's mobility from its investment are far smaller: the average American travels 10 times as many miles on the interstates as the average Japanese travels by high-speed rail. A final interesting feature of the Japanese government's emphasis on passenger rail is that it has had a detrimental effect on freight rail. Rail carries only about 4 percent of Japanese freight, while highways carry 60 percent. By contrast, more than a third of freight goes by rail in the United States, while highways carry a little more than one-fourth.

### AT: Growth – Frontline

#### High speed rail provides only modest economic benefits – it won’t be competitive against air and auto.

Elizabeth Deakin. Prof of City and Regional Planning @ UC Berkeley. December 2010. “Environmental and Other Co-Benefits of Developing a High Speed Rail System in California: A Prospective Vision for 2010-2050.” UCB Center for Environmental Public Policy. <http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/highspeedrail/HSR10_Deakin.pdf>.

Several analysts have been highly critical of these benefits claims. For example, Enthoven et al. (2010) question the magnitude and basis of employment forecasts. A large number of analysts (Levinson (1996), Levinson and Gillen (1996) , Levinson et al. (1996), van Wee et al. (2003), Kemp (2004) and Morris (2009) - among others) show that when the costs of construction are included, benefits per HSR passenger are considerably lower than when operations alone are considered - a point made decades earlier by Lave (1996). Cox and Vranich (2008) and Reason Foundation (ND), among others, note that technological improvements in other modes are also likely and would narrow the gap between HSR and air or auto. Still other analysts, while less critical of HSR in general, note that the environmental benefits are likely to be modest and net benefits will depend largely on travel considerations (Kosinski et al, 2010.)

#### Their economics don’t make sense because we lack population density – most economical travel will use the extra land we have.

Tino Sanandaji, Post-doc @ U. of Chicago, Research Fellow @ Institute of Industrial Economics, “America wrong continent for High-Speed Trains”, 2-8-2011, http://super-economy.blogspot.com/2011/02/america-wrong-continent-for-high-speed.html

Today the White House released a plan to invest anther $53 billion in High-Speed rail. The New York Times headlines this "U.S. Plays Catch-Up on High-Speed Rail", admiring High-Speed trains in China and Europe. Basically, the American Left argues that since Western Europe and China have high-speed rail, and since they believe that Western Europe and China have better economic policy than the United States, we should emulate them and build fast trains. I often argue that European style policies will not work in America because of demographics and cultural differences. I can understand that not all readers are convinced that Americans are that different from Europeans. However, I hope every reader accepts that the U.S is geographically different from Europe and Asia. High-Speed train countries Spain and France have 3 times higher population density than America. China has 4 times higher, Germany 7 times higher, Japan 10 times higher, South Korea 15 times higher and Taiwan 20 times higher population density than the U.S. Germany is more densely populated than New York state, and China more densely populated than California. Countries that like America have a lot land compared to people, such as Canada, Scandinavia, Russia and Australia have not made any large scale investments in high-speed trains.

### AT: Growth – Frontline

#### **The plan is a terrible tax payer deal and prevents innovations in aviation – that’s key to economic output.**

Tino Sanandaji, Post-doc @ U. of Chicago, Research Fellow @ Institute of Industrial Economics, “America wrong continent for High-Speed Trains”, 2-8-2011, http://super-economy.blogspot.com/2011/02/america-wrong-continent-for-high-speed.html

High-Speed trains are not only expensive, they are slow when compared to air-travel. Take one of the least crazy high-speed train projects, connecting Los Angeles and San Francisco. The White House estimates are that this trip will take 2 hours 40 minutes. The same trip by commercial flight takes 1 hours 20 minutes. Even if you add an extra one hour for security check, the trip is faster by air (you also have to drive to the airport, but the same is true for trains). After the first terrorist attack against high-speed trains, the security advantage would diminish. If we really wanted to and had an extra $53 billion over, we could invest in flying faster, in making the security process more effective, or (most sensibly) improving the high-way system. Another fact Liberals ignore is that air-travel is cheaper in the U.S, costing about half per mile of what it does in Europe (perhaps due to economies of scale and higher competitiveness). Investing in High-Speeds trains is likely a "White Elephant", a massive visible project that gets politicians attention, but is a bad deal for tax-payers. I hope we are not building it just to fulfill juvenile fantasies of making the U.S more like Europe.

### AT: Environment – Frontline

#### No net environmental impact – it pollutes just as much as highway traffic.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

2. Environmental Benefits. The environmental benefits of high-speed rail would be negligible at best. President Obama's moderatespeed trains are expected to be powered by diesel locomotives, which burn petroleum and emit pollutants and greenhouse gases. Even electrically powered, true high-speed rail is unlikely to be clean. California rated its proposal as environmentally sound only by projecting impossibly high ridership numbers and unrealistically assuming that future automobiles and airplanes would be no more energy-efficient than they are today. In 2005, Florida's High-Speed Rail Authority proposed a 125-mph rail line between Tampa and Orlando. The environmental impact statement for the proposal estimated that the trains would produce more nitrogen oxide pollution and volatile organic compounds than would be saved by the automobiles taken off the road. It also calculated that operating and maintaining the gas-turbine locomotives would consume 3.5 to 6.0 times as much energy as would be saved by the cars replaced. The statement concluded that "the environmentally preferred alternative is the No Build Alternative" because it "would result in less direct and indirect impact to the environment." The Tampa-Orlando proposal was subsequently killed, only to be revived by the Obama administration. In January, the Department of Transportation announced that Florida will receive $1.25 billion of the $8 billion in high-speed rail stimulus funding for the route.

#### Rail unnecessary – massive alternative energy funding now – included grants.

House Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight Hearing :"Impact of Tax Policies on the Commercial Application of Renewable Energy Technology."[9]. (2012, April). Congressional Documents and Publications. http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/HHRG-112-SY21-WState-MThorning-20120419.pdf

During the recession in the 2008-2009 period, the effort by the federal government to promote the use of renewable energy and alternative vehicles and biofuels accelerated. As provisions of the Recovery Act were being debated, some analysts argued that more grants and loans for renewable energy should be part of the legislation because private sector interest in the sector had declined sharply. For example, Aldy states that during "the financial crisis, the number of tax equity suppliers and the amount of tax equity{for renewable energy}fell by more than half." n10 In fact, it is quite possible that the sudden, dramatic expansion of U.S. natural gas production during that period and the sharp decline in natural gas prices were responsible for a decrease in the private sector's interest in renewable energy investments. As U.S. natural gas production increased, the well-head price dropped from $10.70 tcf in July, 2008 to $3.45tcf in July, 2009. As a result of the decline in natural gas prices, gas became the "fuel of choice" for new electric generation plants.

### AT: Environment – Frontline

#### Fossil fuel use by electricity hedges against solvency, and people will still fly and drive.

Tony Bosworth, Campaigner for Friends of the Earth, “How green is high-speed rail?”, 11-19-2011, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>.

First there's the electricity to power the trains. Over two thirds of the world's electricity comes from fossil fuels so until (or unless) power stations are weaned off fossil fuels, electric trains will still have a significant climate impact -- although rail travel is still better than flying or driving. Secondly, will high speed rail entice people off the roads and short-haul flights? French TGVs and the Channel Tunnel rail link have succeeded, but official calculations estimate that only 16 per cent of anticipated passengers for the London to Birmingham line will have swapped from planes or cars. One of the main factors is cost. Despite soaring fuel prices, motoring and flying are still expected to be cheaper than high speed rail. If faster rail travel is to become a realistic alternative it must be affordable too.

### T – Investment – 1NC

#### A – Interpretation:

Transportation investment must add to transportation assets – these must be preexisting.

Patricia Hu, Director of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, @ US Department of Transportation, “Measuring Transportation Investment: Challenges and Opportunities”, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, 2-9-2012, http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Proceedings/InfrastructureInv/HU.pdf

Transportation investment is defined as additions to transportation fixed assets. Transportation fixed assets refer to: structures, motor vehicles, and other machinery and equipment that are used in the provision of transportation services for more than one year.”

#### Increase means to expand something preexisting – this is distinct from creation.

WORDS AND PHRASES, 1960, 381.

“Increased,” as used in West’s Ann.Cal. Const. art. 12, § 11, providing that the stock and bonded indebtedness of corporations shall not be increased without the consent of the person holding the larger amount of the stock, does not include or apply to the first creation of bonded indebtedness. To give it such meaning would be to inject into the provision the word “create.”

#### B – Violations:

1 – The plan would result in high speed rail tracks being used for exclusive use of high speed rail.

2 – The plan would create high speed rail systems – their inherency proves this doesn’t exist in the squo.

#### **C – Vote negative:**

#### 1 – Ground – they make the topic multidirectional – they can claim advantages premised on decreases in conventional train markets, expansion of high speed tech.

#### 2 – Limits – they open the floodgates to creation of new technologies – the topical version of their aff would be conventional rail investment.

#### D – It’s a voting issue for competitive equity.

### T – Investment – HSR Links

#### There are two ways to do the aff – improve existing conventional rail, or build exclusive high speed tracks – the latter obviously violates our interp, and the former still requires entirely new investments in train fuselages that don’t fall under it either.

Dr. Jean-Paul Rodrigue, Dept. of Global Studies and Geography @ Hofstra University, “The Geography of Transport Systems”, Hofstra University, Copyright 1998-2012, http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch3en/appl3en/ch3a1en.html

High speed trains refer to passenger rail systems running at operational speed between 200 and 300 km/h. The high speed train passenger system era truly originates from Japan with the Tokaido line, bridging Tokyo and Osaka, which began in 1964 with the Tokyo Olympics. Today, this transport mode is perceived as an efficient alternative to highway and airport congestion. Evidence underline that travel time is cut in about a half when a high speed service begins between two city pairs. The setting of high speed train systems has accelerated around the world over the last two decades, particularly in China where since 2000 high speed rail corridors have been rapidly set. Several countries, including the United States, are also planning for high speed rail corridors, but these projects tend to take decades to implement. Dedicated high speed postal trains are used in Europe (e.g. France and Sweden) on a daily basis, but the relative decline of postal use leaves such endeavors with questionable growth potential. High speed trains currently function under two discrete technologies: Improvement of conventional rail. The first type uses existing conventional rail systems and its great velocity is primarily the fact of considerable improvements in locomotive performance and train design. They may not be considered as a pure high speed trains per se. England (London - Edinburgh), Sweden (Stockholm - Gothenburg), Italy (Rome - Florence and Rome - Milan), and the United-States (Boston - Washington) are examples of this type of technology. Trains can reach peak speeds of approximately 200 km/h in most cases and up to 250 km/h in Italy. The principal drawback from using this system, however, is that it must share existing lines with regular freight services. Exclusive high speed networks. In contrast, the second category of high speed trains runs on its own exclusive and independent tracks. In Japan, trains can attain speeds of 240 km/h, but ongoing projects to raise peak speeds at 300 km/h aim at maintaining competitiveness of rail passenger transport versus air. In France, the TGV Sud-Est (Trains a Grande Vitesse) reach speeds of 270 km/h while the TGV Atlantique can cruise at speeds of 300 km/h. One of the key advantages of such a system is since passengers trains have their exclusive tracks, the efficiency of rail freight transport increases as it inherit the almost exclusive use of the conventional rail system.

#### They are straight-up bidirectional – the aff decreases freight rail shipping, aviation investment, and automotive travel.

Dr. Jean-Paul Rodrigue, Dept. of Global Studies and Geography @ Hofstra University, “The Geography of Transport Systems”, Hofstra University, Copyright 1998-2012, http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch3en/appl3en/ch3a1en.html

High speed rail systems can have a substantial impacts on other transport modes, even freight transport systems. One of the most apparent is on air transportation services between cities of the high speed rail corridor, particularly the most distant ones. High speed as able to compete successfully with short to medium distance air transport services as it conveys the advantage of servicing downtown areas and has much lower terminal time, mainly because of less security constraints. Rail stations with high speed rail services are also increasingly becoming transport hubs with the associated demands on urban transport systems, particularly public transit. Regarding high speed rail stations, two dynamics have emerged: The reconversion and usage of central railway stations. The setting of new facilities in suburbia.

### T – Investment - HSR Links

#### Brightline test – the only way they aren’t bidirectional is if they develop separate systems for passenger (high speed) and freight (conventional) – this proves the aff is a creation and provides an \*alternative\* to transportation, not an additional.

Dr. Jean-Paul Rodrigue, Dept. of Global Studies and Geography @ Hofstra University, “The Geography of Transport Systems”, Hofstra University, Copyright 1998-2012, http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch3en/appl3en/ch3a1en.html

For freight transportation, the are several potential impacts, mostly indirect. The most straightforward is that since high speed rail uses its own right of way, the separation between passenger and freight systems promotes the efficiency and reliability of both networks. The main reason is that passengers and freight have different operational characteristics, namely in terms of speed and frequency of service. The setting of high speed networks may also incite additional investments in rail freight infrastructure, particularly in metropolitan areas, better signaling technologies and cost sharing initiatives. Although there have been discussions about the potential of using high speed rail to move freight, these have not yet led to concrete realizations. There are plans to have a high speed rail cargo network in Europe by 2015, which would link major air cargo hubs such as Paris, Liege, Amsterdam, London and Frankfurt. The goal is to provide an alternative to short haul air cargo routes as well as the possibility to move cargo between the hubs.

### Kill HSR CP – 1NC

#### The United States federal government should withdraw its support for high speed rail and expand research and development of transportation infrastructure for aviation and highway travel.

#### Observation One: Competition

#### Mutually Exclusive – it’s impossible to expand high speed rail and eliminate it.

#### Net beneficial – the permutation links to our disads to high speed rail expansion.

#### Observation Two: Solvency

#### The aff fails and links massively to the spending disad – aviation and highway reforms solve all transportation needs and provide a stable return on investment.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

As federal funding gets underway, various states have also launched high-speed rail initiatives. In 2008, for example, California voters gave the green light for the state to issue nearly $10 billion of bonds to partly fund a high-speed rail line from San Francisco to Los Angeles. Rail supporters have dreams of an American high-speed train revolution in the years ahead, but this essay takes a more sober view by looking at the actual costs and benefits of such a system. The reality is that high-speed rail systems are extraordinarily expensive and serve only a small and elite group of people even in those nations that have the longest experience with them. High-speed rail is not a grand solution to America's congestion and mobility problems, as it is often alleged to be. While high-speed trains in Europe and Japan are technologically impressive, nearly all the routes in those jurisdictions lose money and need large subsidies to stay afloat. America's geography is even less suited for a successful high-speed rail system than Europe or Japan because our cities are less dense and spaced farther apart. The federal government should withdraw its support for high-speed rail, and instead focus on major aviation and highway reforms to improve the nation's mobility. America faces major transportation challenges, but throwing taxpayer funds down a high-speed rail money pit will not solve them.

### Kill HSR CP – Solvency – General

#### Mobility means people inevitably fly or drive – only the counterplan stops an unnecessary rail system.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

The mobility benefits of high-speed rail are negligible. Despite huge subsidies, the average residents of France and Japan ride their TGVs and bullet trains just 400 miles a year. With slower trains connecting lower-density cities and regions, the Obama administration's proposed high-speed rail system would be lucky to reach even 100 miles per capita of travel. Even a much more comprehensive, truly high-speed network is unlikely to approach 400 miles per capita because, unlike Europe and Japan, the United States has few major city pairs located close enough for high-speed trains to compete with airlines. High-speed rail's inability to draw more riders should be no surprise considering rail's inherent disadvantages compared with driving and air travel. Driving offers point-to-point convenience, while rail drops most travelers miles from their final destinations. Air service is at least twice as fast as the fastest trains and—since most Americans no longer live or work downtown—leaves average travelers no farther from their destinations than downtown train stations. Though high-speed rail is somewhat competitive on trips of 200 miles or so, it is not the optimal transportation mode at any distance. In sum, a cost-effective high-speed rail system is a fantasy. Modern airliners go much faster than the fastest trains and they do not require expensive infrastructure along their entire routes. Even with a massive government investment, high-speed rail would not likely capture more than about 1 percent of the nation's market for passenger travel. High-speed rail should be killed before it diverts tens of billions of transportation dollars into a black hole, producing negligible benefits.

#### **Passenger trains will never net a profit and only bolster the deficit – the fed should pull out and let it be private.**

Elizabeth Dovell, Contribute at the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, Column on Renewing America, 3-7-2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585>.

The government created Amtrak to preserve a passenger system it knew to be unprofitable and would likely not have survived without its intervention. To date, it continues to lose money and is expected to receive $1.42 billion in federal funding (FY 2012) despite hitting an all-time passenger high of 30 million and ticket sales of $1.9 billion in 2011. The only passenger trains reported to cover their operating costs, according to the Congressional Research Service, are the high-speed Acela trains running in and out of New York City along the Northeast Corridor between Boston and Washington, D.C. Indeed, to increase profitability, Brookings' Robert Puentes urges Amtrak to "focus on and prioritize short-haul corridors that connect our nation's major metros." Others, including some Republicans in Congress, suggest the government should exit the passenger business altogether, including handing the operations of profitable corridors over to private interests (WashPost).

### Kill HSR CP – Solvency – General

#### Aviation and highway systems adapt quickly to environmental concerns – rail does not – solves their advantages better.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Automobile and Airplane Assumptions. In considering the costs and benefits of high-speed rail, fast trains should be compared not to today's cars and planes, but to tomorrow's more efficient cars and planes. If automakers are able to meet the administration's latest fueleconomy targets, and consumers continue to replace the nation's auto fleet at the usual rate, cars and light trucks on the road in 2020 will be almost 25 percent more energy efficient than they are today, on average, and by 2030 they will be 38 percent more fuel-efficient. Meanwhile, the energy efficiency of air travel has increased an average 2 percent per year since 1980. Boeing promises that its 787 plane will be 20 percent more fuel efficient than comparable planes today. Jet engine makers have set a goal of doubling fuel efficiency by 2020. The California high-speed rail authority claims that high-speed trains will produce large energy savings. Yet the authority's own environmental impact statement (EIS) reveals that the benefits will be negligible. The EIS projects that the energy savings from operating high-speed rail will repay the energy cost of construction in just five years. But the EIS assumes that the energy efficiency of autos and planes won't improve. But if, over the lifetime of a high-speed rail project, autos and planes become 30 percent more fuel efficient, then the energy payback period for high-speed rail rises to 30 years. Since rail lines require expensive (and energy-intensive) reconstruction about every 30 years, high-speed rail is not likely to save energy at all. Steven Polzin, of the University of South Florida's Center for Urban Transportation Research, points out that automobiles and buses have relatively short life cycles, so they can readily adapt to the need to save energy or reduce pollution. By contrast, he says rail systems "may be far more difficult or expensive to upgrade to newer, more efficient technologies." The American auto fleet completely turns over every 18 years, and the airline fleet turns over every 21 years, so both can quickly become more fuel-efficient. With rail lines, however, we are stuck for at least three to four decades with whatever technology is selected.

### Private Investment CP – Solvency

#### **Private investment is key to an efficient high-speed rail system – competitive market values key.**

US News, “Should the Government Fund High-Speed Rail?”, US News Staff, News Opinion Column, 2-9-2011, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2011/02/09/should-the-government-fund-high-speed-rail

The federal government has historically funded or subsidized infrastructure projects like highways and rail lines since they are public goods, used by many and aimed at contributing to the country’s overall economic growth. But some members of Congress are already protesting, saying the government isn’t the best entity to pursue rail improvements. “The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again expecting a different result, and that is exactly what Vice President Biden offered,” said Rep. Bill Shuster, a Pennsylvania Republican and chair of the Transportation Committee’s railroads subcommittee. “Government won’t develop American high-speed rail. Private investment and a competitive market will.”

#### **Federally built trains are still not competitive – free markets should determine whether high speed rail is developed – the alternative is an economic bubble.**

Charles Lane, Contributor for the Washington Post, “High speed rail will take tax payers for a ride”, 10-8-2010, Washington Post, http://voices.washingtonpost.com/postpartisan/2010/10/high-speed\_rail\_will\_take\_taxp.html

The reason is obvious, or should be. Trains are very expensive to operate -- yet they must compete against alternatives -- cars, buses and planes -- that are often cheaper for travelers on a per-mile basis. In the U.S., with its well-developed interstate highway system and thousands of airports, this problem would be even worse, as Amtrak's consistent money-losing suggests. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has likened the Obama administration's vision for a high-speed rail network to President Eisenhower's support of the interstate highway system. It never seems to occur to him that the interstate highways helped destroy what was left of passenger rail in this country, because it made it cheap and easy for Americans to drive where they wanted to go. And those highways will still be around to compete with any new system. For cost and convenience, cars beat almost any passenger rail system you can imagine, even a high-speed one. That would be true even if the U.S. adopted European-level gas taxes, which isn't going to happen, anyway. Consider the proposed Tampa-Orlando route, which President Obama promised $1.25 billion in seed money amid much fanfare a year ago. The trip would take about 55 minutes, compared to 90 minutes by car. But the route starts in downtown Tampa and ends at the Orlando International Airport -- which is, like, in the middle of nowhere, roughly 15 miles from Disney World. So once you get there, you'd have to rent a car or schlep your stuff on some bus. After all the hassle and expense of getting to and from the train, you won't have saved any time and you’ll be sorry you didn't drive. And Florida is a relatively propitious place for high-speed rail since the state already owns the necessary land. In California, where the Obama administration and Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) are promising to support a proposed $42.6 billion L.A.-San Francisco line, the new system would have to use existing corridors that belong to freight railroads. And the freight lines don't want to share, noting, rationally, that it wouldn't be safe to crowd the lines with trains traveling all sorts of different speeds. Similar hassles have arisen in other states. Resolving the freighters' issues will drive up the costs of passenger rail, assuming they can be resolved. So far, the Wall Street Journal reports, freight carrier resistance has helped delay the distribution of all but $597 million of the planned $8 billion in passenger rail money. In Europe, subsidized passenger rail has displaced freight from trains to trucks; given traffic, highway safety and the environment, the U.S. has no interest in duplicating that experience. I have ridden the Shinkansen -- Japan's bullet train -- and, let me tell you, it's cool. But in their techno-envy, American advocates of high-speed passenger trains lose any sense of economic rigor. Yes, fast passenger trains may be awesome -- but exactly why do we need them? Cars, buses and planes are already doing a good job of moving people around. If the purpose of high-speed rail is to create jobs, other infrastructure investment can do that. If the purpose is to save energy or limit greenhouse gases, then rail, which uses massive amounts of electricity, much of it presumably generated by coal-fired plants, may be inferior to air or car travel. If there were a compelling passenger-rail business model in the United States, the private sector would have pursued it long ago. Federally-subsidized trains will take this country nowhere, fast.

### **Private Investment CP – Solvency**

#### **Federal money stifles innovation – train development should be done through private entities.**

Dennis Ross, Congress(R) Florida, “High Speed Rail”, Dennis Ross’s congressional page, updated 2012, http://dennisross.house.gov/Issues/Issue/?IssueID=31153

With federal money, comes federal strings. I do not believe in high speed rail, paid for by the taxpayer. Therefore, I sincerely hope the Governor and the Legislature revisit the mechanism I helped create when we first created the high speed rail authority. It would create high speed rail, in a market fashion, without taxpayer money or taxpayer obligation. Here is how it would work: The State would authorize the issuance of revenue bonds. Private investors, individuals, etc would purchase the bonds and that money would finance the construction of the rail. Underwriters would insure the bonds so that there would be no taxpayer liability should the project slow, stop, of fail to succeed. Once it was built, train operators would operate routes and charge market price and concessions operators would operate concessions at the terminals. Both train operators and concessions would pay rents, and those rents would be used to pay the bond holders. The State would have no liability for damages or negligence of rail operators, the State would have no financial stake in the operation of the train sets, and would have no stake in the concessions and who sold what. The State of Florida would only initially issue bonds, but from the day it did through the day the bonds were paid off, State involvement would decrease every day until eventually it would be zero. The underwriters would not underwrite the bonds without solid evidence they could be paid back by the revenues and the underwriters would be on the hook for their repayment, not the taxpayer. In addition, the federal government would have no stake or say in how, when, or what was operated on the rails. The free market will bring us new forms of transportation. If rail can survive on its own, then it will. We cannot, however, prop up an industry with tax dollars just because we want the market to support it. We did it with auto makers, insurance companies, banks, etc and look where that has gotten us. I believe transportation is an essential government function (one of the few, like defense and controlling our borders), but I also believe the best way to innovate is to get the government out of playing in the game, and keep it on the sideline as the referee.

### **States CP – Solvency**

#### States already cooperating together to develop high speed rail – they could it.

NWI Times, Times Staff, “States agree to move forward on high-speed rail study”, 5-4-2012, NWITimes Online, http://www.nwitimes.com/article\_b699ad6b-55bb-5123-88a2-01723b6b42a7.html

Indiana, Illinois and Michigan will work together on a study seeking ways to reduce rail congestion and allow trains to travel at higher speeds along the Chicago-to-Detroit high-speed rail corridor. U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said Friday the study's goal will be to reduce passenger travel times between the two hubs and more efficiently move freight between the Chicago-Porter segment, which is one of the nation's busiest. A $3.2 million grant from the Federal Railroad Administration and $200,000 from each of the states and Norfolk Southern will fund the study. An important part of the study will be reducing congestion by linking a double track passenger main to the 110 mph service at Porter. The Porter Junction, a web of tracks on the town line between Porter and Chesterton, is a key link on the Chicago-to-Detroit high-speed route. Trains can already reach speeds of 110 mph from Porter to Kalamazoo, Mich.

#### Grants already exist for states that want high speed rail – individual state action is good, because those that choose not to participate free up grants for other states – augments solvency.

Michael Grunwald, Staff Writer for TIME, “No high speed rail funds for two states that don’t want it”, 12-9-2010, Time US, http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2036197,00.html

The Republican governors-elect of Wisconsin and Ohio have both pledged to shut down the federal high-speed rail initiatives in their states. Today, the Obama administration is beating them to the punch. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood announced this afternoon that he will redirect about $1.2 billion in high-speed grants from Wisconsin and Ohio to a dozen other states that want to continue their programs. California and Florida, the big winners in last year's grant competition, will get the bulk of the redistributed money as well, up to $624 million and $342 million respectively; Washington ($161 million) and Illinois ($42 million) will get most of the rest. (See more on how high-speed rail went off track in Wisconsin.) "I am pleased that so many other states are enthusiastic about the additional support they are receiving to help bring America's high-speed rail network to life," LaHood said.

### States CP – Solvency

#### Despite federal cuts, California has shown it can build on its own – federal manipulation complicates the process – delays in building are net beneficial because it ushers in the best tech.

Will Oremus, Writer for Slate, “Requiem for a Train”, 12-7-2011, Slate Technocracy, http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\_speed\_rail\_is\_dead\_in\_america\_should\_we\_mourn\_it\_.html

Some will point out that California’s high-speed rail plan still isn’t dead, exactly. (It’s “more of a zombie,” one blogger quipped.) State officials, backed by Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown, have concentrated their efforts on building just one leg, from agricultural Fresno to dusty Bakersfield, as a sort of desperate foot-in-the-door tactic. They still have the Obama adminstration’s support. “We are not going to be dissuaded by critics,” transportation secretary Ray LaHood said this week. "We are only at the beginning of this multi-generational process—the simple fact is that the transportation challenges that are driving increased demand for rail are not going away." That’s true, but the chances that California—or the country—will meet those challenges now look dim. The modern federal government isn’t good at solving long-term problems (if it ever was). Most Republicans don’t believe the government should solve problems. They believe big government, in fact, is the one of the only problems that can’t be solved by the free market. Democrats, as seen in the failures of all of these railroad projects, err by assuming that the government can solve problems more effectively than it realistically can. Ultimately, high-speed rail’s backers weren’t as staunch as its detractors. Barack Obama and congressional Democrats put their political lives on the line for health care, addressing an immediate problem whose consequences were personal and visceral. The nation’s outdated infrastructure is a major dilemma but one that doesn’t feel as pressing to most voters and legislators. It’s our children’s problem now. If there’s a silver lining to high-speed rail’s spectacular failure, it’s that these trains were outdated years ago. Even if all went according to the Obama administration’s plans, the nation’s rail network would have remained meager and backward by comparison to those in Japan and China. Those countries are already building trains that run via magnetic levitation. Suspended a few inches above a guideway, maglev trains fly through the air at speeds greater than 300 mph, with minimal wear and tear. At this point in their development, maglev tracks are dauntingly expensive to build. But those costs might well come down by the time America is ready to get serious about its transportation infrastructure. At this rate, there seems to be plenty of time.

### Freight DA – 1NC

#### **High speed rail would cause congestion – decimates freight train industries.**

Elizabeth Dovell, Contribute at the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, Column on Renewing America, 3-7-2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585>.

But challenges remain. Freight rail will need substantial investment in the future, despite its current success. Congestion is on the rise, and capacity must increase by approximately 90 percent to meet estimated demands by 2035, according to the U.S. Transportation Department. Re-regulation and the potential for track sharing with high-speed and express intercity rail could also put the freight industry under strain. President Obama has proposed a 110 mile-per-hour intercity passenger speed limit, which could create congestion problems for slower-running freight trains.

#### Freight rail is key to US manufacturing competitiveness, and prevents environmental degradation via alternative means of freight shipping.

Elizabeth Dovell, Contribute at the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, Column on Renewing America, 3-7-2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585>.

Compared to other modes of freight transport, rail also has a smaller environmental impact, better fuel efficiency, and lower costs over large distances. Steel wheel technology makes rail far more efficient than truck freight due to limited rolling resistance: railcars become more efficient as more weight is added. Trains can now move one ton of cargo approximately 484 miles on just one gallon of fuel, according to the American Association of Railroads. Lower freight rail costs save consumers money and help keep U.S. manufacturers globally competitive. According to Dr. Pasi Lautala, director of the Rail Transport Program at Michigan Technological University, "If you talk to industry experts, everyone has a positive outlook on the future of the freight rail industry, because it makes sense if you look at the world right now. You look at the economic advances, especially in fuel consumption compared to truck traffic and the limitations of marine transportation."

#### US economic prestige is key to checking rising powers – American leadership independently checks war.

Zalmay Khalilzad, Former ambassador to the United Nations, 2-8-2011, “The Economy and National Security,” National Review, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=2

American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. Since the end of the Cold War, a stable economic and financial condition at home has enabled America to have an expansive role in the world. Today we can no longer take this for granted. Unless we get our economic house in order, there is a risk that domestic stagnation in combination with the rise of rival powers will undermine our ability to deal with growing international problems. Regional hegemons in Asia could seize the moment, leading the world toward a new, dangerous era of multi-polarity.

### Politics DA – Plan Unpopular – Republicans

#### The politics of rail have changed – Republicans are staunch in their opposition to the plan.

Michael Cooper, Staff Writer, “For High-Speed Rail, Support in the Past From G.O.P. Presidential Hopefuls”, New York Times, 1-2-2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/03/us/politics/for-high-speed-rail-support-in-the-past-from-gop-presidential-hopefuls.html>

Before the politics of rail was scrambled in recent years, Republican support for high-speed rail was not unusual. As recently as 2004, the Republican Party platform stated that “Republicans support, where economically viable, the development of a high-speed passenger railroad system as an instrument of economic development and enhanced mobility.” But the politics of rail changed considerably after Mr. Obama persuaded Democrats in Congress to include $8 billion for passenger rail and high-speed rail in his $787 billion stimulus plan. States initially competed fiercely for the money, but that shifted after the 2010 midterm elections swept Republicans into power in Congress and in many statehouses. New Republican governors in Ohio and Wisconsin rejected hundreds of millions of dollars in federal aid that their states had won to build up their passenger rail systems. Then Florida, which won $2.4 billion in federal money to build the nation’s first true high-speed rail system between Orlando and Tampa, sent back the money after its new Republican governor, Rick Scott, said it would be a boondoggle. Republicans in Congress have since blocked the Obama administration’s requests for more rail spending.

#### Plan spurs Republican opposition to government subsidies and regulation – inclusion of unions triggers the link.

Michael Cooper, Staff Writer, “For High-Speed Rail, Support in the Past From G.O.P. Presidential Hopefuls”, New York Times, 1-2-2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/03/us/politics/for-high-speed-rail-support-in-the-past-from-gop-presidential-hopefuls.html>

Against that backdrop, some rail advocates said it was a hopeful sign that some Republican presidential candidates have a history of supporting high-speed rail. “I hope that we can move past high-speed rail being a partisan issue — it certainly wasn’t always that way,” said Petra Todorovich, the director of America 2050, a branch of the Regional Plan Association, an independent urban research and advocacy group. “While politicians may differ over how to structure and manage high-speed rail, politicians on both sides of the aisle have recognized that there are certain corridors in the United States where this makes sense.” Spokesmen for Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Perry did not respond to e-mails seeking comment about their views on rail. But Mr. Gingrich outlined his views in his 2008 book, “Real Change: From the World That Fails to the World That Works,” saying that the California, Florida and the Northeast Corridor from Boston to Washington are all “very conducive to this kind of high-speed train investment.” But he does take a different tack from the Obama administration and many Democrats by arguing that development of rail has been stymied by “union work rules,” the inefficiency of Amtrak, politicians in Washington who subsidize uneconomic routes and “the regulations and litigation involved in large-scale construction in the United States.”

#### No appetite – rail enthusiasts aren’t even putting up a fight on cuts.

Fawn Johnson, Correspondent for the National Journal, “High-Speed Rail in a Coma”, The National Journal Transportation Experts Blog, 1-17-2012, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php

Policymakers' appetite for high-speed rail seems to be dwindling to almost nothing. It is old news that congressional Republicans are not fans of President Obama's high-speed rail initiative. They view it as a waste of taxpayer dollars at a time when belt-tightening is of the highest order. The national conversation has not advanced much beyond that point, perhaps because the biggest fans of high-speed rail are distracted by other problems. Democrats in Congress raised only a faint protest when the fiscal 2012 appropriations bill cut funding for the Transportation Department's high-speed rail program. Republicans who ostensibly like high-speed rail said the cuts will allow rail enthusiasts to start over from scratch.

### Politics DA – Plan Unpopular – Funding Battles

#### Funding climate ensures the plan faces fierce opposition.

Elizabeth Dovell, Contribute at the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, Column on Renewing America, 3-7-2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585>.

Funding for the upkeep and expansion of passenger rail--which receives significantly less in federal subsidies than other transportation modes--has remained a controversial issue in Washington. The Obama administration's plan to expand high-speed rail (sustained speeds of more than 125 miles per hour) faces fierce opposition. Supporters cite the unique benefits of high-speed rail, including energy savings, more efficient mobility, and greater manufacturing opportunities for U.S. companies. Moreover, many U.S. economic competitors in Asia and Europe are making significant investments in HSR (WashPost). Opponents argue the economic benefits of HSR rarely surpass the costs, and point out that most systems do not turn a profit and rely heavily on government subsidies.

#### Obama is tied to the plan, and is controversial – it entails major fights in the senate.

Elizabeth Dovell, Contribute at the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, Column on Renewing America, 3-7-2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585>.

When President Obama took office in 2009, as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, he allocated $8 billion for high-speed rail projects. The administration also announced the creation of the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail program. The proposal included a $1 billion per year allocation for the next five years for high-speed rail investment in strategic areas around the country, such as Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles. The HSIPR program was also designed to address other outstanding rail transport problems around the country, and sought to upgrade existing passenger rail lines to increase speed and efficiency of services. In February 2011, Vice President Biden announced a six-year plan to build a HSR network that would fulfill President Obama's promise to grant HSR access to 80 percent of the country within twenty-five years. But in November 2011 the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives killed HSR stimulus funding (USA Today), a measure that was controversial from the start. It faced opposition at the state level, where some lawmakers and policy analysts claimed high-speed rail was impractical and a waste of taxpayer dollars. Republican governors from Florida, Ohio, and Wisconsin rejected their HSR stimulus grants (TransportationNation), calling for the redistribution of funds to other infrastructure and transportation projects. In spite of the funding setback, the Department of Transportation announced in its 2011 DoT Year in Review the accumulation of $9.4 billion in Federal Railroad Administration grants for HSR innovation.

#### Primary Florida opposition proves libertarians collapse on national rail proposes – Tea Party would hate it.

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

Last month’s decision by Governor Scott of Florida to reject federal funding for high-speed rail reflects the combination of bad information and partisan thinking that motivated all three governors to turn their backs on the future. In making his decision, Scott says he relied heavily on a January report by the libertarian Reason Foundation, which is funded by major conservative organizations, oil companies, and companies involved in highway construction. The Reason Foundation report was riddled with inaccuracies, exaggerations, and distortions, such as a claim that the construction of the Orlando-Tampa line could cost Florida taxpayers $3 billion in capital cost overruns. That figure was arrived at by comparing the project in Florida to California, which faces far tougher right-of-way and land-use issues. The Tampa-Orlando line already has a long-established right of way on the Interstate 4 median, making it much cheaper to build. In addition, the eight international rail consortia seeking to construct the Florida line have guaranteed that they will cover operation, maintenance, and subsidy costs for 30 years.

### Spending DA – Links

#### The plan would cost tens of billions of dollars the nation doesn’t have – cost estimates are always too conservative, guaranteeing spending explosions.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Even though moderate-speed passenger trains are less expensive than true high-speed trains, they are still very expensive. Upgrading the 12,800 miles of track in the administration's plan to moderate-speed rail standards would cost far more than the $14.5 billion the president has proposed to spend so far. The entire 12,800-mile Obama-FRA system would cost at least $50 billion. Rather than build the entire system, Obama's plan really just invited states to apply for funds to pay for small portions of the system. For example, the administration granted close to $1 billion to Wisconsin to upgrade existing tracks from Milwaukee to Madison to 110-mph standards. This 85-mile line is only a tiny portion of the eventual planned route from Chicago to Minneapolis, and no one knows who will pay the billions necessary to complete that route. One cautionary note on high-speed rail costs comes from California. In November 2008, California voters agreed that the state should sell nearly $10 billion worth of bonds to start constructing a 220-mile-per-hour high-speed rail line from San Francisco to Los Angeles. The state's estimated cost for the entire system jumped from $25 billion in 2000 to $45 billion by 2008. However, one independent analysis concluded that the rail line would cost up to $81 billion. Thus, the costs of a true high-speed rail system would be far higher than the costs of a medium-speed system on existing tracks, as envisioned by the Obama administration. To build a 12,800-mile system of high-speed trains would cost close to $1 trillion, based on the costs estimates of the California system. It is unlikely that the nation could afford such a vast expense, particularly since our state and federal governments are already in huge fiscal trouble.

#### Only a risk of a link – the plan would require a new rail system, and would never make a return on investment.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

While the Obama administration has started funding high-speed rail, it has no detailed financial plan, no cost estimates for the proposed system, no source of long-term funding, and no expectation that passenger fares will cover all of the operating costs or any of the capital costs. Only two high-speed rail routes in the world, Tokyo-Osaka and Paris-Lyon, earn enough revenues to cover capital and operating costs. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) plan, upon which the Obama administration is basing its high-speed rail ideas, could more accurately be titled "moderate-speed rail." For the most part, it calls for trains running no faster than 110 miles per hour, which high-speed rail aficionados do not even consider to be true high-speed rail. Such trains would hardly be innovative: starting in the 1930s, several American railroads regularly operated passenger trains at top speeds of 110 miles per hour or more. Yet those fast trains did not stop the decline of passenger trains after World War II. Amtrak today runs trains at top speeds of 100 miles per hour or more in several corridors, but top speeds are far greater than average speeds. For example, the average speed in the Boston-to-Washington corridor is less than 85 miles per hour. The Obama administration has two reasons for focusing on moderate-speed rail instead of true high-speed rail. First, a complete network of true high-speed rail lines would be "prohibitively expensive," according to Amtrak's president. Thus, Obama's plan calls for running 110- mile-per-hour passenger trains on existing tracks shared with freight trains. For safety reasons, faster trains would require the construction of an entirely new rail system. It is much less expensive to upgrade existing tracks to support 110-mile-per-hour trains than to build brandnew tracks. Second, the administration wants to aid private freight railroads at the same time it builds the new passenger rail system. President Obama hopes that upgrading freight lines to run faster passenger trains will also allow the railroads to increase their freight speeds and capacities, thus capturing traffic from truckers. Historically, the freight railroads have received very little federal aid: only 18,700 of 350,000 miles of rail lines built in the United States received federal subsidies. Adding new federal subsidies at a time of massive federal budget deficits is not a good idea, and it could lead to the reregulation of the freight railroads, which were deregulated in 1979.

### Spending DA – Links

#### ‘Time saved’ calculations miss the technological boat – there’s no positive correlation with economic productivity.

Tim Worstall, Contributor for Forbes, “All High Speed Rail Programs Must be Cancelled and the Numbers Calculated Again”, 1-8-2012, Forbes Magazine Online, http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2012/01/08/all-high-speed-rail-programs-must-be-cancelled-and-the-numbers-calculated-again/

Take instead one little boring technical detail about how we work out the costs and benefits of such schemes. The costs, even though the estimations are usually out by a factor of between 2x and 10x, is in theory at least simple to measure. How much does it cost to buy the land, build a railroad and then keep it running? The benefits, well, actually, they’re in large part the time saved by people because the trains are moving faster. They’re not stuck on a train so long waiting to get somewhere, they are somewhere faster and thus can do more. When you look into the details of these calculations (this is certainly true for HS2 in hte UK and I would be absolutely astonished if it is different elsewhere, as this is the standard method) the standard value ascribed to the time is the average pay of the people doing the travelling. There is a low number ascribed to those travelling for leisure (for complex reasons we won’t go into here), a higher value ascribed to those travelling in regular, standard or second class and a higher value ascribed to those travelling in first class. To make up numbers, leisure travel might be valued at £5 an hour of time saved in travel, work related but standard class £15 and first class at £50. While those are made up numbers they’re not all that far off the actual numbers. The reason or this is that we’re trying to measure the extra economic activity that is going to happen as a result of the faster travel. That’s what gives the boost to GDP of having infrastructure after all, the increase in economic activity that comes about from having infrastructure. Now, for decades, the standard assumption has been that while people are trapped in a metal tube travelling at speed (plane or train) they’re not doing any work. Thus reducing travel time increases the mount of work that can be done when they’re outside the metal tube. However, is this actually true any more? As the UK blog “Idle” points out, no, it isn’t: Time-saving necessity? 20 minutes, at HUGE cost per minute per punter; so huge, in fact, that the minimum ticket price for a one-way ticket on the Great White Elephant Line (trademark, Idle) looks like being £80 (in today’s money) when the thing finally gets rolling. This is, in other words, a line for people travelling on expenses. Businessmen and public servants, in other words. Or the carelessly rich. All of whom, obviously, have smartphones and tablets at their disposal to work in transit. The pro-HS2 lobby, unsurprisingly, provide their cost/benefit analysis on the basis that time spent on a train is time wasted. This isn’t so much stupid as plainly dishonest. I’m willing to go with stupid rather than dishonest for now. For once the system for doing this sort of analysis is laid down it’s incredibly hard to get people to change it. But it must be changed and changed quickly before any more money is spent on any of these schemes. We’ve had a technological change: time spent in transit is no longer wasted time, in fact if you talk to people these days I’m sure you’d find many of them claiming that sitting on a train, on a plane, with the internet running, is more productive than much time spent in offices. I could put this in personal terms: I’ve just spent 14 hours of today crossing Europe, from one specific small town in Portugal to one small town in Germany. Which would I prefer, a 5 hour trip (possible if there were direct flights) or a 14? Obviously the 5 hour. But offer me, say, a 10 hour trip with good internet coverage or a 5 hour one without and I’ll take the longer one thank you. Because I know that I can work while travelling now. But it really is true, that we need to cancel all of the high speed rail lines currently proposed and start all over again. Because recent technological changes, the way in which you can now work while travelling, have made all of the numbers we currently use incorrect. I also think I know what the answer will be: if we reduce the value of the time saved from HST to just the comfort value of that time saved (broadly speaking this would be the same as the leisure value) and entirely ignore the higher value of lost working hours (because we’re not getting any lost working hours now) then no high speed transport system will pass the cost benefit analysis. Something, which of course, means none of them should ever be built.

### Spending DA – Link Magnifiers

#### Operation costs inflate the link.

Randal O’Toole. Fellow @ CATO. June 2010. “High Speed Rail.” CATO Institute. <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail>.

Also, consider how the costs would rise even higher once a new rail system gets underway. The 12,800-mile FRA network reaches only 42 states and only a handful of cities in those states. Every excluded state and city is represented by senators and representatives who will wonder why their constituents have to pay for a rail system that only serves other areas. And even in the 42 states in the plan, routes are discontinuous, with no high-speed links between many pairs of major cities such as New York and Chicago. Groups representing all the excluded routes would lobby for rail lines, and overall costs would balloon over time. And the costs mentioned are only the capital costs. Most high-speed rail lines wouldn't cover their operating costs, so there would have to be billions of dollars in ongoing subsidies to the system. If the ridership on an expensive new rail system was very large, the high costs would seem more reasonable. But, unlike the interstate highway system, which is heavily used by almost all Americans, only a small elite would use high-speed rail. In 2007, the average American traveled 4,000 miles and shipped 2,000 ton-miles of freight over the interstate highways. By comparison, total annual use of a high-speed rail system would not likely be much more than 100 miles per person. And considering the premium fares charged to ride high-speed rail, most users would likely be higher-income white-collar workers**.**

#### Plan immediately collapses freight – kills global economic competitiveness in the short term.

Elizabeth Dovell, Contribute at the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S. Rail Infrastructure”, Column on Renewing America, 3-7-2012, <http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-rail-infrastructure/p27585>.

Rail is an essential component of a balanced national transportation (PDF) system and a globally competitive economy. The American Society of Civil Engineers, which graded U.S. rail infrastructure with a C-, notes that the rail industry requires $200 billion in investment by 2035 to meet projected future demand. In the United States, modern freight and passenger rail systems share the same corridors and infrastructure. But while privately owned U.S. freight has succeeded in remaining competitive with other transportation modes, federally run passenger rail has struggled. Experts say the continued success of freight rail will require billions in new funding to avoid congestion, particularly if plans for expanding passenger rail proceed.

#### Comparatively larger link to the economy – aff’s returns on investment take \*decades\*.

Fawn Johnson, Correspondent for the National Journal, “High-Speed Rail in a Coma”, The National Journal Transportation Experts Blog, 1-17-2012, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php

High-speed rail investments aren't like economic stimulus programs, which are intended to jump start shovel-ready projects that can immediately inject money into a local economy while delivering jobs and paved roads. The initial costs of developing high-speed rail lines are high, and the yield time is years or decades. Is the country ready for long-term investments like that? Or would it make sense to take a break and allow the economy to recover before proposing big new rail projects? What would make policymakers more receptive to high-speed rail? What critiques of high-speed rail are the most in need of a response?

## Green Stimulus Neg

### 1NC States Counterplan – Highways

#### The 50 states and territories should substantially increase investment in sustainable highways.

#### The counterplan competes based on the politics disadvantage to the plan.

#### State department of transportations have the expertise and capability to solve

Marlys Osterhues, environmental protection specialist with the FHWA Office of Project Development and Environmental Review, 12-2006, “On the Way to Greener Highways,” Public Roads, http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/06nov/07.cfm

Woven throughout the Green Highways concept are the critical drivers of integrated planning, market-based approaches, regulatory flexibility, and environmental streamlining. "Green Highways represents the next logical step in the evolution of FHWA and State DOT efforts in environmental streamlining and stewardship, building on recent investments over the last few years," says Shari Schaftlein, team leader for program and policy development at FHWA's Office of Project Development and Environmental Review.

#### Regional flexibility is vital for solvency

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Preliminary research on the Green Roads system has shown that the system can be implemented in Washington State with promising outcomes. However, the Green Roads system needs extensive research in order to be implemented for areas outside the Northwest. In addition, much concern has been expressed by professionals in the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as well as many other agencies that any rating system will need to be flexible to change.

#### It’s necessary to have regional flexibility – uniform standards will fail

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Many technologies either are not relevant to every region of the United States, or cannot be transferred to different regions without extensive retrofitting. A rating system must be designed such that officials from each region of the United States can evaluate regional needs, then assign a point scale accordingly. It is important to address the need for separate rating scales for multiple regions, because a single scale rating system will not cater to every region of the United States.

### States Solve Environmental Policy

#### States are comparatively better than the federal government

Barry G. Rabe, Professor @ University of Michigan, 12-2002, Pew Center, “Greenhouse and Statehouse,” Pew Climate, http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/states\_greenhouse.pdf

States have been formulating climate change policy for more than a decade, although their efforts have expanded and intensified in the past several years. In some cases, states have considered climate change mitigation explicitly while in others it has been an incidental benefit. Reflective of the vast scope of activity that generates greenhouse gases, state policies have been enacted that reduce these emissions in such areas as promotion of renewable energy, air pollution control, agriculture and forestry, waste management, transportation, and energy development, among others. In almost all cases, there have been multiple drivers behind and multiple benefits from these state policies.

#### States have tons of incentives available to promote sustainability

Sanya Carleyolsen, PhD candidate Public Policy @ UNC, 2006, “Tangled in the Wires,” Journal of Natural Resources, p. 496

State legislatures also have a variety of tax incentives at their disposal to help bring down the costs of RE projects and make them more cost-competitive with other fuel methods. Many states have adopted tax incentive systems that can be applied to corporate, income, property or sales taxes. Such corporate and income tax incentives provide deductions or credits for purchased RE equipment.

#### Decentralized approaches are more efficient

Jonathan H. Adler, Associate Law Professor @ Case Western, 1-2005, “Judicial Federalism,” Iowa Law Review, p. 377

Decentralized approaches to environmental protection have many potential advantages over centralized regulatory regimes. Decentralization can enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of environmental controls. No less important, decentralization can allow for experimentation with alternative approaches to environmental protection with which there is relatively little practical experience. "By decentralizing environmental decision making, we may be able to obtain improved responsiveness to changing circumstances and new information," notes Professor Farber.

#### The federal government will model the states

Jonathan H. Adler, Associate Law Professor @ Case Western, 1-2005, “Judicial Federalism,” Iowa Law Review, p. 377

As with water pollution, once a given air pollution problem was clearly identified and understood, state and local governments began enacting measures to address these concerns before the federal government got into the act. Indeed, in some cases the early state efforts became the model for subsequent federal measures.

### The Plan is Popular

#### Widespread support exists for the plan

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

There is much support for the development of a green highway rating system. The Recycled Materials Resource Center believes that the development of a rating system may help extend current needs for research. Leif Wathne, Director for Highways at the American Concrete Pavement Association, expressed the need to increase the awareness of highway sustainability across many disciplines by defining highway sustainability. However, many agencies have differing views on the development of rating systems. Some believe that a rating system would prove counterproductive, while some believe that a rating system is premature.

#### Taking unilateral action to prevent global warming is publicly popular

Ruy Teixeira, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, 12-14-2009, “Public Opinion Snapshot: Public Says Go Green With or Without a Climate Agreement,” Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/12/snapshot121409.html

In a multicountry survey conducted by WorldPublicOpinion.org for the World Bank, U.S. respondents said, by 73-24, that our country has a responsibility to take action against climate change even if the other countries at the conference can’t come to an agreement. Moreover, most Americans (62 percent) say they would be willing to pay some costs as part of taking action against climate change—either $39 a month (48 percent) or $19.50 a month (14 percent).

#### Even if the plan is expensive, the public supports it

Ruy Teixeira, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, 12-14-2009, “Public Opinion Snapshot: Public Says Go Green With or Without a Climate Agreement,” Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/12/snapshot121409.html

The public also favors a series of specific steps to help deal with climate change, even though they all involve costs of one kind or another: preserving or expanding forested areas, even if this means less land for agriculture or construction (75 percent favor); limiting the rate of constructing coal-fired power plants, even if this increases the cost of energy (64 percent favor); gradually increasing the requirements for fuel efficiency in automobiles, even if this raises the cost of cars and bus fares (71 percent favor); and gradually reducing government subsidies that favor private transportation, even if this raises its cost (62 percent favor).

### The Plan is Not Popular

#### Top agencies don’t want new regulations

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Some opposition to a green highway rating system can be found within agencies that are not in support of higher levels of regulations throughout the federal system. One example is the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). John Bukowski, Deputy Director and Senior Pavement Engineer with FHWA explained that the FHWA can not currently support the development of a rating system (Appendix A).

#### There is no political support for the plan

Art Hirsch, TerraLogic Staff, 2-2012, “The Lack of Infrastructure Funding for Highway Maintenance and Enhancement,” Terra logics, http://terralogicss.com/\_blog/Sustainable\_Transportation/post/The\_Lack\_of\_Infrastructure\_Funding\_for\_Highway\_Maintenance\_and\_Enhancement/

The push for better infrastructure must now come from an educated traveling public, since politicians do not have the political will to ask for unpopular increased taxes and/or fees. The educated public needs to provide input to DOTs management and politicians about their desire for better transportation systems to improve and maintain their quality of life and the future competitiveness of the states.

#### The GoP will tie the plan to global warming and backlash

John Rennie, Staff @ Scientific American, 3-16-2011, “House Repubs Vote That Earth Is Not Warming,” Scientific American, http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode.cfm?id=house-repubs-vote-that-earth-is-not-11-03-16

All Republicans on the House Energy and Commerce Committee voted against an amendment that states that global warming exists, regardless of cause. John Rennie comments Congress has finally acted on global warming—by denying it exists. It’s in the grand lawmaking tradition of the Indiana state legislature’s 1897 attempt to redefine the value of pi. The Republican-led House of Representatives is currently working on the Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011, which would bar the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating carbon dioxide emissions to mitigate climate change.

### The Status Quo Solves

#### The plan is unnecessary because actions are already being taken to promote green highways

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Federal, State, and local government agencies have taken an active role in promoting the use of green transportation infrastructure, but paradoxically, those same entities have often erected regulatory barriers which prevent widespread implementation. On the federal level, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has begun promoting the use of green infrastructure, including transportation infrastructure, through its Office of Water. In March 2007, Assistant Administrator Ben Grumbles released a memo to regional administrators encouraging the acceptance of green infrastructure to protect water quality (Appendix I). The EPA also recently signed an agreement with a number of environmental organizations to assist State and local governments in implementing green infrastructure projects.

#### The US has accounted for environmental issues since the 1960’s

John Bartle, Professor of Public Administration @ U of Nebraska, and Jijesh Devan, PhD Candidate, 2006, “Sustainable Highways: Destination or Mirage?,” Public Works Management and Policy, vol. 3, issue 10

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 is one of the most significant federal acts that established links between transportation, communities, and environmental values (Horan et al., 1999). The act mandated use of an integrated transportation planning process for highway construction and created 10 “planning elements” related to land use and social and community values. The Department of Transportation Act of 1966 restricted the use of highway development in parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, historic sites, and cultural sites. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 mandated public hearings and citizen participation for highway projects and assistance for people displaced by highways.

#### Voluntary practices are succeeding now

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Numerous companies, non-profits, and industry organizations have developed programs to specifically promote environmentally-friendly advances in construction techniques and technologies with varying levels of success. Market-driven techniques are most effective: demonstrating that green transportation infrastructure is attractive to consumers as part of a corporate citizenship initiative has been an effective means of encouraging implementation. For example, Turner Construction Company, one of the largest construction companies in the United States, recently worked with Wal-Mart to develop a ''green supercenter'' which incorporated green transportation elements such as bio-swales and pervious pavement as part of an overall sustainability initiative that was formulated to build community goodwill.

### The Affirmative’s Harms Are Solved Now

#### Federal commitments to green infrastructure are strong now

Benjamin Grumbles, former EPA administrator, former professor of law @ GWU, President of the Clean Water America Alliance, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

We have made and are continuing to make major investments in the implementation of programs and practices to protect and restore waters that are impacted or may be impacted by stormwater, urban runoff, and combined sewer overflows. Green infrastructure can be both a cost-effective and an environmentally preferable approach to reduce stormwater and other excess flows entering combined or separate sewer systems in combination with, or in lieu of, centralized hard infrastructure solutions. We will continue to work with this committee, our federal colleagues, and the many partners, stakeholders, and citizens who want to promote green infrastructure to achieve our water quality goals as well as to promote more livable communities.

#### Energy efficiency is already a priority in highway planning

John Bartle, Professor of Public Administration @ U of Nebraska, and Jijesh Devan, PhD Candidate, 2006, “Sustainable Highways: Destination or Mirage?,” Public Works Management and Policy, vol. 3, issue 10

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 mandated inclusion of environmental impact statements with all federal projects affecting the environment. The Clean Air Act of 1970 created emissions standards leading to national ambient air quality standards (Horan et al., 1999). The Clean Air Act of 1977 institutionalized conformity regulations and sanctions against noncompliance with air quality standards and, later, the Clean Air Act of 1990 strengthened compliance regulations and emissions standards. The next major piece of legislation was ISTEA, which declared the policy of the U.S. government to develop a transportation system that is “economically efficient and environmentally sound while moving individuals and property in an energy efficient way” (cited in Benfield & Replogle, 2002, p. 10638).

#### The Green Highways Partnership already promotes sustainability

Federal Highway Administration, 2006, “Green Highways Partnership: Bringing Together Transportation and the Environment,” US Department of Transportation, http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/focus/06jun/04.cfm

Combining safe and efficient transportation systems with environmental stewardship and sustainability is the goal of the recently launched Green Highways Partnership (GHP). The partnership builds on the success of the Green Highway Forum, held in November 2005 in College Park, Maryland. Sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the event brought together more than 400 transportation and environmental professionals involved in the planning, design, construction, maintenance, and regulation of transportation projects. "We realized that FHWA and EPA had been pursuing parallel agendas to combine transportation and environmental goals, and decided to join efforts,"says Jason Harrington of FHWA's Office of Pavement Technology.

### The Economy is Strong Now

#### The US economy is strong now

Chris Rugaber, AP Staff, 5-16-2012, “US economy picks up after early spring slump,” Washington Post, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jtyBN6G8AfD4zZVpDUIbIqNdKJKQ?docId=2550c45d0e914b7fbc7a8577564e081d

Maybe the U.S. economy's strength this winter wasn't just weather-related after all.

Home construction is near a three-year high. And factory output has risen in three of the year's first four months. The data released Wednesday suggest growth in the April-June quarter is off to a good start, helped by falling gas prices and solid hiring gains. Fears of a spring slump are easing.

#### Most qualified evidence concurs that the economy will remain strong

Jomo Sundaram, United Nations assistant secretary-general for economic development, was awarded the Wassily Leontief Prize for Advancing the Frontiers of Economic Thought

Jomo, 10-25-2011, “The bogey of fiscal stimulus,” Business World, http://www.bworldonline.com/content.php?section=Opinion&title=The-bogey-of-fiscal-stimulus&id=40496

After the economic disaster of 2008-2009, people are understandably wary of the devastation that yet another financial crisis can wreak. But the likelihood of another crisis is quite small, and its adverse impact would be far less devastating this time around, as there are no more massive credit or asset bubbles to burst. That has not stopped pundits and the media from exaggerating such fears, distracting from greater efforts to overcome protracted stagnation for much of the developed world, which will inevitably drag down economic recovery elsewhere, especially in developing countries.

#### Oil prices are low now, that drives growth

Joseph Lazzaro, International Business Staff, 10-27-2011, “With Europe Plan in Place, All Eyes Turn to Fed,” International Business Times, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/238930/20111027/eurozone-greece-europe-federal-reserve-fed-qe-qe2-qe3-bernanke-inflation-gdp-financial-crisis-debt-c.htm

The U.S. economy grew at a 2.5 percent rate in the second quarter. Until then, more than likely Bernanke will note the recovery slowdown, outline that the recovery is still not at a sufficient growth rate, and underscore that the Fed remains prepared to take additional action if deflation pressures emerge or if the economy slows further. What could really benefit the economy -- and make Bernanke's job easier? A GDP tailwind from a substantial fall in oil prices. And the U.S. economy may get just that, assuming Libya oil production starts to increase following the ouster and passing of Leader Moammar Gadhafi: Libyan output ran at one-tenth its 1.8 million barrel per day average during the civil war.

### New Spending Hurts the Economy

#### Stimulus fails – empirical examples prove

Reidl Riedl, MA in Public Affairs @ Princeton, 1-8-2010, “Why Government Spending Does Not Stimulate Economic Growth: Answering the Critics,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703481004574646551469288292.html?mod=WSJ\_latestheadlines

Indeed, President Obama's stimulus bill failed by its own standards. In a January 2009 report, White House economists predicted that the stimulus bill would create (not merely save) 3.3 million net jobs by 2010. Since then, 3.5 million more net jobs have been lost, pushing the unemployment rate above 10 percent. The fact that government failed to spend its way to prosperity is not an isolated incident: • During the 1930s, New Deal lawmakers doubled federal spending--yet unemployment remained above 20 percent until World War II. • Japan responded to a 1990 recession by passing 10 stimulus spending bills over 8 years (building the largest national debt in the industrialized world)--yet its economy remained stagnant. • In 2001, President Bush responded to a recession by "injecting" tax rebates into the economy. The economy did not respond until two years later, when tax rate reductions were implemented.

#### The most recent recession proves that Keynesian economic theory is incorrect

Reidl Riedl, MA in Public Affairs @ Princeton, 1-8-2010, “Why Government Spending Does Not Stimulate Economic Growth: Answering the Critics,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703481004574646551469288292.html?mod=WSJ\_latestheadlines

Economic data contradict Keynesian stimulus theory. If deficits represented "new dollars" in the economy, the record $1.2 trillion in FY 2009 deficit spending that began in October 2008--well before the stimulus added $200 billion more--would have already overheated the economy. Yet despite the historic 7 percent increase in GDP deficit spending over the previous year, the economy shrank by 2.3 percent in FY 2009.To argue that deficits represent new money injected into the economy is to argue that the economy would have contracted by 9.3 percent without this "infusion" of added deficit spending (or even more, given the Keynesian multiplier effect that was supposed to further boost the impact). That is simply not plausible, and few if any economists have claimed otherwise.

#### Best models prove that there are no fiscal multipliers

JD Foster, “Keynesian Fiscal Stimulus Policies Stimulate Debt--Not the Economy,” 2009, Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Economy/bg2302.cfm

In contrast, John Cogan and his colleagues used a state-of-the-art macroeconomic model constructed by Frank Smets and Rafael Wouters. The Smets-Wouters model embodies the "new Keynesian" approach to macroeconomic analysis. Among the differences from older models, such as those used by Romer and Bernstein, Smets-Wouters includes forward-looking, or rational, expectations. Cogan found the impact in the first year of a Keynesian stimulus to be "very small" and that the multipliers are less than one as consumption and investment are crowded out.

### Public Spending Trades off with Private Productivity

#### Private spending will solve recovery, but increasing the debt too much hampers growth

Gerald O’Driscoll, former vice president at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, 7-7-2010, “Keynes vs. Hayek: The Great Debate Continues,” The Wall Street Journal, http://www.relooney.info/0\_New\_7552.pdf

Second, the London professors disputed that it mattered not the form spending took, whether on consumption or investment. They saw a "revival of investment as peculiarly desirable," as do today's proponents of supply-side economics. They distinguish between hoarding of money and savings that flows into securities, and reaffirm the importance of the securities markets in transforming savings into investment. Their third and greatest disagreement with Keynes was over the benefits of government spending financed by deficits. They demurred. "The existence of public debt on a large scale imposes frictions and obstacles to readjustment very much greater than the frictions and obstacles imposed by the existence of private debt." This was not the time for "new municipal swimming baths" (Keynes's example). In our contemporary context, no stimulus.

#### Stimulus crowds-out US investment

Neil Howe, Doctorate in History, Master’s in economics from Yale, senior associate at the CSIS, and, Richard Jackson @ the Concord Coalition, 10-18-2004, “The Other Deficit,” Concord Coalition, http://www.concordcoalition.org/publications/facing-facts/2004/1018/other-deficit

Let's start with why budget deficits matter. Economically, the problem is that they absorb national savings and crowd out productive investment. Gregory Mankiw, the author of America's best-selling economics textbook and chairman of President Bush's Council of Economic Advisers, explains it this way. Because investment is important for long-run economic growth, government budget deficits reduce the economy's growth rate. In other words, they can slow and even halt the steady rise in material living standards that has always nourished the American Dream. This “crowding out” wouldn't matter as much if American businesses and households were prodigious savers. But in fact, the United States has long had the lowest private savings rate of all major industrial nations--and the rate is falling, not rising.

#### New inflation collapses the economy

Fareed Zakaria, PhD in pol sci @ Harvard, 12-12-2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” Newsweek Magazine, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

Severe inflation can be far more disruptive than a recession, because while recessions rob you of better jobs and wages that you might have had in the future, inflation robs you of what you have now by destroying your savings. In many countries in the 1970s, hyperinflation led to the destruction of the middle class, which was the background condition for many of the political dramas of the era—coups in Latin America, the suspension of democracy in India, the overthrow of the shah in Iran. But then in 1979, the tide began to turn when Paul Volcker took over the U.S. Federal Reserve and waged war against inflation. Over two decades, central banks managed to decisively beat down the beast. At this point, only one country in the world suffers from -hyperinflation: Zimbabwe. Low inflation allows people, businesses, and governments to plan for the future, a key precondition for stability.

### Government Spending Can’t Help the Economy

#### There is zero empirical support for stimulus-based economic growth

Robert Barro, Professor of Economics @ Harvard, 7-24-2011, “Keynesian Economics vs. Regular Economics,” Hoover, http://www.hoover.org/news/daily-report/90486

Theorizing aside, Keynesian policy conclusions, such as the wisdom of additional stimulus geared to money transfers, should come down to empirical evidence. And there is zero evidence that deficit-financed transfers raise GDP and employment—not to mention evidence for a multiplier of two. Gathering evidence is challenging. In the data, transfers are higher than normal during recessions but mainly because of the automatic increases in welfare programs, such as food stamps and unemployment benefits.

#### Short-term costs offset supposed gains

JD Foster, “Keynesian Fiscal Stimulus Policies Stimulate Debt--Not the Economy,” 2009, Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Economy/bg2302.cfm

Simple observation has its place, but how does the Keynesian stimulus approach break down in theory? Keynesian stimulus theory ignores the second half of the story: Deficit spending must still be financed, and financing carries budgetary consequences and economic costs. Proponents generally acknowledge the long-term budgetary costs, but ignore the offsetting near-term consequences that render Keynesian stimulus useless. In a closed economy, government borrowing reduces the pool of saving available for private spending, either investment or consumption. Government lacks a wand to create real purchasing power out of thin air (with the fleeting exception of monetary expansions, discussed below).

#### There is no stimulus effect

JD Foster, “Keynesian Fiscal Stimulus Policies Stimulate Debt--Not the Economy,” 2009, Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Economy/bg2302.cfm

Government spending or deficit-increasing tax cuts increase demand as advertised; and government borrowing reduces demand by the same amount, for no net change. The dynamics in an open economy are slightly more complicated, but the final outcome for output is unchanged. An open economy permits a government to finance its deficits by importing savings from abroad as the United States has done for years, rather than by tapping domestic sources. However, an increase in deficit spending met by an increase in net imports of foreign savings must, in turn, be matched by an increase in net imports of goods and services to preserve the balance of payments. Thus, the increase in domestic demand due to deficit spending is fully offset by a reduction in demand arising from an increase in net exports. Once again, Keynesian stimulus has no effect.

### Plan is not Proven

#### The plan is not proven to be effective

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 2008, “Exploring Green Highways,” Standardization News, WISE, http://www.astm.org/SNEWS/SO\_2008/bryce\_so08.html

Before any new technology can be introduced in society, it must be verified by a consistent history and accepted as safe for use. Most techniques that will lead to the creation and implementation of a green highway system are very young. Standards and research will aid in the development of a track record for technologies, but implementation of technology requires performance assurance. In addition, some concerns about green highway rating systems can be found within government. One view in FHWA is that implementing green highway classifications is premature and counterproductive.

#### The plan only solves new highways – otherwise, it’s too expensive

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

The installation of green transportation infrastructure can be impeded by problems of high cost and availability of space for technologies. For measures that are installed directly on the roadway, unless new infrastructure is being constructed, there are high costs associated with removing old materials and installing new surfaces. Additionally, the disruption to traffic and business is extremely costly. In many urban areas, there is also not space on the roadside or around parking lots to install measures such as bio-swales, limiting local governments' choices of technology.

#### No contractors are trained to implement green practices

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Finally, there are social challenges to widespread implementation of green transportation infrastructure. The transportation construction industry is highly decentralized, and stakeholders range from State governments to private developers. As a whole, the industry tends to be risk-averse, and hence reluctant to adopt technologies that may be considered experimental or unproven because of concerns about high cost, reliability, maintenance, or simply confusion about the best products to use. The slow adoption of these technologies has also led to a shortage of trained contractors who are able to properly design and install integrated systems, making implementation more difficult and costly.

### The Plan Doesn’t Solve Globally

#### Global highway use is set to rapidly increase

John Bartle, Professor of Public Administration @ U of Nebraska, and Jijesh Devan, PhD Candidate, 2006, “Sustainable Highways: Destination or Mirage?,” Public Works Management and Policy, vol. 3, issue 10

Highway transportation affects all four dimensions of sustainability. The issues raised by highway transportation are likely to be intensified in the future as mobility needs increase in the United States and globally. Many of those in the 85% of the global population who do not own an automobile are likely to purchase one in the near future (Hawken, Lovins, & Lovins, 1999). Between 1990 and 2000, passenger-miles traveled increased by 24% in the United States (Bureau of Transportation Statistics [BTS], 2003). Forecasts imply a rapid increase in global highway travel, doubling from 1990 to 2020, and then redoubling again by 2050. In the United States, highway travel is projected to double from 1990 to 2050 (Schafer & Victor, 1997). This increase in mobility will challenge the attainment of long-run sustainability.

#### Highway unsustainability is a global problem

FA Johnston, Management Planner, 2006, “Sustainable Affordable Highway Management and Maintenance PPP,” Euro Transport, http://www.euromedtransport.org/image.php?id=1565

Throughout the world, the highway asset has suffered from decades of under-investment due to: • lack of investment in planned or periodic maintenance • the lack of whole cycle management strategy • annuality of budgeting • lack of effective and efficient routine and cyclical maintenance • level of service has been budget driven rather than performance based.

#### Asian highways are increasing now

Working Group on the Asian Highway, 9-2011, “Policies and issues relating to the development of the Asian Highway,” Economic and Social Commission for Asia, http://www.unescap.org/ttdw/common/TIS/AH/files/wgm4/AHWG4\_3E.pdf

The Intergovernmental Agreement on the Asian Highway Network entered into force on 4 July 2005, marking the beginning of a new era in the development of international highways in the ESCAP region. The Asian Highway network, together with the Trans-Asian Railway network, on which another intergovernmental agreement came into effect on 11 June 2009, have become important building blocks for the realization of the vision of an international integrated intermodal transport system in Asia, receiving priority attention in national programmes of member countries.

### The Plan Hurts the Environment

#### New highways inevitably destroy the environment

Elaine Hopkins, Peoria Staff Writer, 11-2009, “"Green Highways' an Oxymoron?,” Peoria Story, http://peoriastory.typepad.com/peoriastory/2009/11/green-highways-an-oxymoron.html

The Heart of Illinois Sierra Club hosted two speakers on 'green highways' at its Nov. 18 meeting. New highways inevitably destroy farmland, forests and wetlands. That's not green. But in keeping with current trends, highway advocates are hoping to greenwash their road building. "We now realize we need to be respectful of the environment," Mike Lewis of the Illinois Department of Transportation told the group.

#### Bureaucracy will co-opt the plan to build useless highways

Elaine Hopkins, Peoria Staff Writer, 11-2009, “"Green Highways' an Oxymoron?,” Peoria Story, http://peoriastory.typepad.com/peoriastory/2009/11/green-highways-an-oxymoron.html

Asked why it should be built at all, he responded "it's a big question and (IDOT) is wrestling with it. There's no overriding need, no congestion," but "if this is what you want for the quality of life...." Federal funding agencies need a "purpose and need statement" for the proposal, he said. Asked whether it would be built if Caterpillar, Inc. closes its Mossville factory, he responded that if Caterpillar closes Mossville, "we' don't need it."

#### New highways cause suburbanization which hurts the environment

Nate Baum-Snow, Professor of Economics @ Brown, 7-2006, “Did Highways Cause Suburbanization,” Brown University, http://www.econ.brown.edu/fac/nathaniel\_baum-snow/hwy-sub.pdf

Between 1950 and 1990, the aggregate population of central cities in the United States declined by 17 percent despite population growth of 72 percent in metropolitan areas as a whole. This paper assesses the extent to which the construction of new limited access highways has contributed to central city population decline. Using planned portions of the interstate highway system as a source of exogenous variation, empirical estimates indicate that one new highway passing through a central city reduces its population by about 18 percent. Estimates imply that aggregate central city population would have grown by about 8 percent had the interstate highway system not been built.

### Other Things are Causing Environmental Destruction

#### Resource consumption hurts the environment more than highways

Jeremy Hance, MA from St. John’s College, 5-15-2012, “Consumption, population, and declining Earth: wake-up call for Rio+20,” Mongabay, http://news.mongabay.com/2012/0515-hance-living-planet-report-full.html#

Human society is consuming natural resources as if there were one-and-a-half Earths, and not just a single blue planet, according to the most recent Living Planet Report released today. If governments and societies continue with 'business-as-usual' practices, we could be consuming three years of natural resources in 12 months by 2050. Already, this ecological debt is decimating wildlife populations worldwide, disproportionately hurting the world's poor and most vulnerable, threatening imperative resources like food and water, heating up the atmosphere, and risking global well-being.

#### Habitat loss in tropical regions is devastating the environment

Jeremy Hance, MA from St. John’s College, 5-15-2012, “Consumption, population, and declining Earth: wake-up call for Rio+20,” Mongabay, http://news.mongabay.com/2012/0515-hance-living-planet-report-full.html#

Ecosystems are under tremendous pressure, especially in the tropics, according to the report's outlook on biodiversity. Since 1970, the benchmark year for the Living Planet Report, biodiversity has declined by 28 percent worldwide. Tracking 2,688 vertebrate species around the world, researchers have detailed a sharp decline in tropical regions (61 percent) between 1970 and 2008. Freshwater species in the tropics are the worst off of all, declining by 70 percent [click here for more on tropical wildlife loss].

#### Deforestation and overfishing make biodiversity loss inevitable

Lisa Schlein, Staff at the Voice of America, 5-14-2012, “WWF: Earth Biodiversity Declining Rapidly,” Voice of America, http://www.voanews.com/content/wwf\_earth\_biodiversity\_declining\_rapidly/666457.html

So you will see this in the report: If countries step up and end net deforestation by 2020 - and many countries have already pledged to do this - then you could save 180 million hectares of forest by 2050, compared to business as usual," he said. The environmentalists also are urging nations to become more energy-efficient. They say nations should develop renewable energy, in particular wind and solar. They say this can make nations fuel independent, save them money and slow down climate change by lowering carbon dioxide emissions. They are calling for better water management and a stop to over-fishing.

### No Impact to Global Warming

#### There is no impact to global warming

J. Scott Armstrong, Professor of Marketing specializing in forecasting technology, 3-31-2011, “Climate Change Policy Issues,” CQ Congressional Testimony, pg. 7

Global warming alarmists have used improper procedures and, most importantly, have violated the general scientific principles of objectivity and full disclosure. They also fail to correct errors or to cite relevant literature that reaches conclusion that are unfavorable. They also have been deleting information from Wikipedia that is unfavorable to the alarmists' viewpoint (e.g., my entry has been frequently revised by them). These departures from the scientific method are apparently intentional. Some alarmists claim that there is no need for them to follow scientific principles. For example, the late Stanford University biology professor Stephen Schneider said, "each of us has to decide what is the right balance between being effective and being honest." He also said "we have to offer up scary scenarios" (October 1989, Discover Magazine interview). Interestingly, Schneider had been a leader in the 1970s movement to get the government to take action to prevent global cooling.

#### Climategate proves there is insufficient evidence for warming

J. Scott Armstrong, Professor of Marketing specializing in forecasting technology, 3-31-2011, “Climate Change Policy Issues,” CQ Congressional Testimony, pg. 7

ClimateGate also documented many violations of objectivity and full disclosure committed by some of the climate experts that were in one way or another associated with the IPCC. The alarmists' lack of interest in scientific forecasting procedures and the evidence from opinion polls (Pew Research Center 2008) have led us to conclude that global warming is a political movement in the U.S. and elsewhere (Klaus 2009). It is a product of advocacy, rather than of the scientific testing of multiple hypotheses.

#### Warming doesn’t lead to extinction

Scott Barrett, Professor and Director of International Policy, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 2006, “CATASTROPHE: The Problem of Averting Global Catastrophe,” Chicago Journal of International Law, pg. 72

Less dramatic changes are more likely. Abrupt transformations in climate would probably cause few deaths. Many scientists have remarked that climate change would increase the spread of disease, and seasonal weather changes are associated with outbreaks of many diseases, including meningococcal meningitis in sub-Saharan Africa and rotavirus in the US. Moreover, stronger El Nino events have been linked to the prevalence of cholera in Bangladesh, the spread of Rift Valley fever in East Africa, and malaria incidences on the Indian subcontinent. However, while the spread of disease is influenced by the weather, the connection between global climate change and the spread of disease has not yet been established. One point is clear: as Rees notes, "Not even the most drastic conceivable climate shifts could directly destroy all humanity."

### The World is Cooling

#### The world is cooling quickly

Alan Carlin, PhD in Economics, former Director @ EPA and fellow @ RAND, 3-2011, “ A Multidisciplinary, Science-Based Approach to the Economics of Climate Change,” International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, Vol. 8, pg. 2

On the contrary, the evidence is that during interglacial periods over the last 3 million years the risks are on the temperature downside, not the upside. As we approach the point where the Holocene has reached the historical age when a new ice age has repeatedly started in past glacial cycles, this appears likely to be the only CAGW effect that mankind should currently reasonably be concerned about. Earth is currently in an interglacial period quite similar to others before and after each of the glacial periods that Earth has experienced over the last 3 million years. During these interglacial periods there is currently no known case where global temperatures suddenly and dramatically warmed above interglacial temperatures, such as we are now experiencing, to very much warmer temperatures.

#### Temperatures are moving down now

Alan Carlin, PhD in Economics, former Director @ EPA and fellow @ RAND, 3-2011, “ A Multidisciplinary, Science-Based Approach to the Economics of Climate Change,” International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, Vol. 8, pg. 2

There is rather instability towards much colder temperatures, particularly during the later stages of interglacial periods. In fact, Earth has repeatedly entered new ice ages about every 100,000 years during recent cycles, and interglacial periods have lasted about 10,000 years. We are currently very close to the 10,000 year mark for the current interglacial period. So if history is any guide, the main worry should be that of entering a new ice age, with its growing ice sheets, that would probably wipe out civilization in the temperate regions of the Northern Hemisphere—not global warming. The economic damages from a new ice age would indeed be large, and almost certainly catastrophic. Unfortunately, it is very likely to occur sooner or later.

#### Solar variations outweigh human-induced warming

Nils-Axel Mörne Morner, former head of the Paleogeophysics and Geodynamics department at Stockholm University, 2011, “Arctic Environment by the Middle of This Century,” Energy & Environment, Vol 22, No. 3, pg. 7

This is in sharp contrast to the scenarios of IPCC (2001) and ACIA (2004), which predict a unidirectional continued warming leading to the opening of the Arctic basin within this century. Their prediction is based on modelling excluding the effects of the Sun, however. Personally, I am convinced that we need to have “the Sun in the centre” (Mörner, 2006a, 2006b), and doing so, we are indeed facing a new Solar Minimum in the middle of this century. Whether this minimum will be as the past three once were (Figure 6), or it will be affected by anthropogenic factors, is another question. The date of the New Solar Minimum has been assigned at around 2040 by Mörner et al. (2003), at 2030-2040 by Harrara (2010), at 2042 ±11 by Abdassamatov (2010) and at 2030-2040 by Scafetta (2010), implying a fairly congruent picture despite somewhat different ways of transferring past signals into future predictions.

### Economic Growth Hurts the Environment

#### Economic growth collapses the environment

Manisha Shekhar, Professor of Electronics and Communications, 1-30-2009, “Environment does not allow further economic growth in the world?,” Ecommerce, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world

However, as the scale of human societies has steadily increased and technology has developed ever faster, the pressure on the environment has likewise increased enormously. Fuelled, by a runaway global economic system—which has created both unprecedented affluence (over consumption) and enormous levels of poverty —environmental deterioration now threaten to increase inequalities and cause irreversible harm to ecosystems on a global scale.

#### Structural changes in consumption are necessary to prevent environmental harm

Manisha Shekhar, Professor of Electronics and Communications, 1-30-2009, “Environment does not allow further economic growth in the world?,” Ecommerce, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world

These drastic environmental problems, e.g. the changing climate and the depletion of the ozone layer, are mainly the result of unsustainable lifestyles, over consumption and unhealthy patterns of development. Also these environmental problems are likely to hit the poor and marginalized first—and with the most drastic consequences—but will sooner or later also affect the privileged. Unless curbed (through wide ranging, structural changes) these global environmental trends threaten to cause havoc to whole ecosystems and essential life-supporting systems. This may in turn lead to an immense, unprecedented crisis for the whole of humanity.

#### Economic growth is the primary driver of environmental harm

Ted Trainer, Lecturer @ South Wales University in Australia, 2007, Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain A Consumer Society, p. 14

The foregoing argument has been that the present levels of production and consump- tion are grossly unsustainable. They are far too high to be kept going for long or to be extended to all people. Yet we are determined to increase present living standards and levels of output and consumption, as much as possible and without any end in sight. Our supreme national goal is economic growth. It is not just that people want more and more income, wealth, property and possessions, without any amount in view with which they will be satisfied. The core problem is that we have an economic system which needs and cannot function without constant growth in production and consumption.

## Sequestration DA

### Sequestration DA 1NC 1/3

#### Budget sequester is coming now – Reid guarantees

Scott Wong, 5-24-2012, “GOP hits back at Reid threat on sequester,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76749.html

Reid was defiant in an interview with POLITICO this week, saying that without new revenues, he wouldn’t accept GOP efforts to roll back the spending cuts, part of the Budget Control Act, which Obama signed into law last August. The supercommittee had an opportunity to strike a deal on deficit reduction last fall and avoid the sequester, but the bipartisan House-Senate panel struck out. “I am not going to back off the sequestration,” Reid said in the interview. “That’s the law we passed. We did it because it wouldn’t make things easy for us. It made it so we would have to do something. And if we didn’t, these cuts would kick in.” It’s almost certain Reid has the 40 votes needed to block GOP attempts to undo the sequester, which will hit the Pentagon with $110 billion in cuts on Jan. 1. Last week, nearly 60 senators voted to reject Rep. Paul Ryan’s House-passed budget, which would postpone any cuts to defense spending.

#### Plan is new spending, which undercuts congressional appropriators and kills sequestration

NPR, 10-23-2011, “Congressional Strongmen, Stripped Of Superpowers,” http://www.npr.org/2011/10/23/141616737/congressional-strongmen-stripped-of-superpowers

Since the supercommittee was formed in August to find federal deficit cuts, the House and Senate appropriations committees have seen their responsibilities wane. But not too long ago, they were the most exclusive clubs in Congress and it took years to get assigned to one. Appropriations 'Lost Its Luster' Rep. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., finally landed a spot on the House Appropriations Committee last fall. That's because few others wanted the job — he jokes to Guy Raz, host of weekends on All Things Considered. "It's kind of lost its luster for most people," Flake says. In a recent issue of the The New Republic, reporter Eliza Gray says it is quite possibly "the least fun time to be an appropriator on the record." For most of the past few decades, appropriators decided how the federal budget would be spent, and consequently had a lot of power. In fact, the subcommittee chairmen were known around Capitol Hill as the "cardinals" — like those who run the Catholic Church. But over the summer, President Obama and congressional Republicans took that power away from appropriations and put six Democrats and six Republicans on the new Joint Selection Committee on Deficit Reduction — the official name for the supercommittee — to do the work instead. Rep. Jim Moran, D-Va., a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, says "the supercommittee is an indictment of the whole congressional process." "It shows that the system is dysfunctional today," Moran says. "What we have is a system that's been turned upside down." 'The System Worked' Moran remembers when being on the committee was a mark of serious power. After Mt. Saint Helens erupted in 1980, Sen. Warren Magnuson, D-Wa., who was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee at the time, was able to get $1 billion in emergency aid for his home state. Another senator, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, wondered why he couldn't get that kind of money, Moran recalls. "Sen. Inouye said, 'Maggie [Magnuson], I have thousands of volcanos. Why can't I get a billion dollars for each volcano?' And Maggie put his hand on Dan Inouye's hand, who was young at the time, and said, 'Danny, your time will come.' "Well, Danny's time has come. He takes very good care of Hawaii. You know, the system worked," Moran says. Although appropriators earned a reputation for pork-barrel politics, Moran says that's an oversimplification. He says major projects we now take for granted could never get off the ground because the Republican leadership has banned so-called earmarks. Moran points to a project he successfully funded while on the committee — fixing the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, a major thoroughfare that connects Virginia to Maryland. "We pushed for three years to get that earmark in place. We did it. And the whole country benefits," he says. "We're proud of it. But there was no conceivable way you could have ever built the Woodrow Wilson Bridge to handle the East Coast traffic unless it had been an earmark." Biding Time In addition to their diminished power, House appropriators have been displaced from their room in the Capitol with a view of the National Mall; a women's bathroom is being built there. Moran says it's symbolic. "It's a diminution of the power of appropriators," Moran says. Rep. Flake agrees. "I'm not saying there's not things to do. But I think we could certainly make use of our time better if we were conducting more oversight and doing more hearings," Flake says. Flake and his fellow appropriators are more or less biding their time until Nov. 23, when the supercommittee has to present Congress with a spending plan. The plan is expected to lay out billions of dollars in spending cuts. "That's pretty sad commentary on where we've come to as a Congress in not being able to prioritize, but if it's the only way we can cut spending, then that may be what we have to do," Flake says.

### Sequestration DA 1NC 2/3

#### Following through with sequestration is key to maintaining the US AAA credit rating

Daniel Bases, Staff Writer, 12-22-2011, “Fitch Warns U.S. Of Credit Downgrade Unless Debt Problem Is Solved,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/12/22/fitch-warns-us-credit-downgrade-debt-problem-solved\_n\_1164972.html

Fitch Ratings on Wednesday warned again that the United States' rising debt burden was not consistent with maintaining the country's top AAA credit rating, but said there would likely be no decision on whether to cut the rating before 2013. Last month, Fitch changed its U.S. credit rating outlook to negative from stable, citing the failure of a special congressional committee to agree on at least $1.2 trillion in deficit-reduction measures. "Federal debt will rise in the absence of expenditure and tax reforms that would address the challenges of rising health and social security spending as the population ages," Fitch said in a statement. "The high and rising federal and general government debt burden is not consistent with the U.S. retaining its 'AAA' status despite its other fundamental sovereign credit strengths," the ratings agency said. In a new fiscal projection, Fitch said at least $3.5 trillion of additional deficit reduction measures will be required to stabilize the federal debt held by the public at around 90 percent of gross domestic product in the latter half of the current decade. Fitch, when it lowered its outlook to negative, had said it was giving the U.S. government until 2013 to come up with a "credible plan" to tackle its ballooning budget deficit or risk a downgrade from the AAA status. "A key task of an incoming Congress and administration in 2013 is to formulate a credible plan to reduce the budget deficit and stabilize the federal debt burden. Without such a strategy, the sovereign rating will likely be lowered by the end of 2013," Fitch reiterated. Rival ratings agency Standard & Poor's cut its credit rating on the United States to AA-plus from AAA on August 5, citing concerns over the government's budget deficit and rising debt burden as well as the political gridlock that nearly led to a default. On November 23, Moody's Investors Service, warned that its top level Aaa credit rating for the United States could be in jeopardy if lawmakers were to backtrack on $1.2 trillion in automatic deficit cuts that are set to be made over 10 years. The plan for automatic cuts was triggered after the special congressional committee failed to reach an agreement on deficit reduction. Moody's said any pullback from the agreed automatic cuts to take effect starting in 2013 could prompt it to take action.

#### Credit rating is key to heg—future economic and military success

Reuters, 11-12-2011, “Some see hope as US battles to bring debt under control”, Gulf News, http://gulfnews.com/business/economy/some-see-hope-as-us-battles-to-bring-debt-under-control-1.928435

The narrative of US decline gained force over the past year as Washington's domestic battles over government spending led another ratings agency, Standard & Poor's, to downgrade the country's AAA credit rating in August. Robert Hormats, the State Department's top official for international economic policy, said the chief US challenge now was to refocus its spending on education and infrastructure to keep up with cash-flush competitors such as China, which are rapidly modernising. "Whether we're the primary, competitive power in the world 10 to 15 years from now depends on what I call the law of long lead times," Hormats said. "We have to demonstrate our political system can deliver results... We need to invest." Those investments could depend on decisions reached by the congressional "super committee" tasked with finding at least $1.2 trillion in budget savings within two weeks. With Republicans and Democrats at odds over tax hikes and the future of mandated spending for social safety net programmes, such as Social Security and Medicare, discretionary spending on everything from foreign aid to the military is in focus. Most participants at the Summit agreed that how the debate is resolved could have a major impact on US global power. Republican Senator Lamar Alexander said the US future as a global power depended on a deficit reduction agreement, saying bluntly that "failure is not an option." "Our standing will suffer worldwide most if we can't take care of business at home, and the first order of business at home is to stop borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend," he said.

### Sequestration DA 1NC 3/3

#### Collapse of heg causes regional nuclear wars, massive proliferation, economic collapse and forces US reengagement.

Robert J. Lieber, Professor of Government and International Affairs @ Georgetown University. *The American Era: Power and Strategy for the 21st Century*. 2005. Pg. 53-54.

Withdrawal from foreign commitments might seem to be a means of evading hostility toward the United States, but the consequences would almost certainly be harmful both to regional stability and to U.S. national interests. Although Europe would almost certainly not see the return to competitive balancing among regional powers (i.e., competition and even military rivalry between France and Germany) of the kind that some realist scholars of international relations have predicted,2’ elsewhere the dangers could increase. In Asia, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan would have strong motivation to acquire nuclear weapons — which they have the technological capacity to do quite quickly. Instability and regional competition could also escalate, not only between India and Pakistan, but also in Southeast Asia involv­ing Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia, and possibly the Philippines. Risks in the Middle East would be likely to increase, with regional competi­tion among the major countries of the Gulf region (Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq) as well as Egypt, Syria, and Israel. Major regional wars, even­tually involving the use of weapons of mass destruction plus human suffering on a vast scale, floods of refugees, economic disruption, and risks to oil supplies are all readily conceivable. Based on past experience, the United States would almost certainly be drawn back into these areas, whether to defend friendly states, to cope with a humanitarian catastrophe, or to prevent a hostile power from dominating an entire region. Steven Peter Rosen has thus fit­tingly observed, “If the logic of American empire is unappealing, it is not at all clear that the alternatives are that much more attractive.”22 Similarly, Niall Ferguson has added that those who dislike American predominance ought to bear in mind that the alternative may not be a world of competing great powers, but one with no hegemon at all. Ferguson’s warning may be hyperbolic, but it hints at the perils that the absence of a dominant power, “apolarity,” could bring “an anarchic new Dark Age of waning empires and religious fanaticism; of endemic plunder and pillage in the world’s forgotten regions; of economic stagnation and civilization’s retreat into a few fortified enclaves.”23

### Yes Sequestration – General

#### Sequester will happen – dems and the GOP won’t deal on new revenue

Scott Wong, 5-24-2012, “GOP hits back at Reid threat on sequester,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76749.html

Even defense-friendly Democrats say they’re sticking with Reid and the sequester until Republicans are ready to deal on new revenue — a demand they’ve repeatedly scoffed at. “If Republicans are willing to put revenue on the table — which is what a fair and balanced approach is — we’ll be able to get there,” said Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.), who served as co-chairwoman of the failed supercommittee and whose state is home to more than 80,000 Boeing workers. Dubbed Taxmageddon, Congress will have to contend with a bevy of tax and debt issues after the November election: expiring Bush-era tax cuts and the payroll tax cut, how to raise the debt ceiling and the steep cuts to the Pentagon and other federal agencies slated for Jan. 1. In an interview with POLITICO, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) suggested that Obama may not want to tackle deficit reduction, entitlement reform and other fiscal issues in the lame-duck session if Republican Mitt Romney wins the White House. “If we have the kind of election I’d like to see, with genuine change, I think the Democrats are not going to want to do any heavy lifting as they’re packing their bags and moving out,” McConnell said. “I would not anticipate any particular profiles in courage, shall I say, after just getting your butt kicked in an election.”

#### Even if sequestration doesn’t happen, any new spending will be offset

Scott Wong, 5-24-2012, “GOP hits back at Reid threat on sequester,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76749.html

But the defense policy bill that cleared the Armed Services Committee on Thursday includes a similar provision directing the Pentagon to inform Congress about the impacts of sequestration. “I personally think that staving off sequestration is something that needs to happen before the election,” Ayotte told POLITICO. “I don’t think we should put our military and put our defense industrial base and our national security [at risk] and play political football with it.” Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin predicted that the automatic cuts will be scrapped before November, but like Reid and Murray, he insisted that revenue must be part of the equation. “I think we’ll avoid sequestration, but the only way to avoid it is if everybody is in the soup together,” the Michigan Democrat said.

#### Sequestration will happen despite attempts at repeal – any spending will be offset with other reductions

Trish Turner, 2-2-2012, “Senators Unveil Sequester Repeal,” Fox News, http://politics.blogs.foxnews.com/2012/02/02/gop-unveils-bill-prevent-mandatory-defense-cuts

While President Obama has threatened to veto any effort to ditch the so-called sequester, saying there would be "no easy off ramps here," some red-state Democrats may be inclined to support the GOP effort. Still, a battle is expected. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., blasted the GOP effort Thursday, telling reporters, "I believe an agreement is an agreement. A handshake - a handshake...They should keep their word." And though Reid's lieutenant, Sen. Patty Murray of Washington, did not close the door to a replacement of the scheduled cuts, the senator, who also chairs the Democrats' campaign committee, made clear that she intends to bring a popular Democratic political message to the fight. "This plan isn't about avoiding sequestration, it's about avoiding having millionaires pay their fair share," Murray accysed in a statement. "If Republicans are serious about replacing the automatic spending cuts then they are going to need to work with Democrats to find an equal amount of balanced deficit reduction that doesn't simply increase the pain for the middle class."

### Yes Sequestration – Obama Veto

#### Obama is holding the line on defense spending – will veto GOP attempts

Jeremy Herb, 5-15-2012, “Obama administration threatens veto over Defense Bill,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/budget-approriations/227577-obama-administration-threatens-veto-over-defense-bill

The Obama administration threatened Tuesday to veto the House version of the Defense authorization bill that's headed to the floor this week over restrictions on implementing the New START treaty, reducing the U.S. nuclear arsenal and limiting the transfer of Guantanamo detainees. The veto threat also conditionally extends to the overall size of the bill, which is $3.7 billion above President Obama’s request and $8 billion higher than the Budget Control Act spending caps. The veto threat is an early attempt by the administration to influence the Defense bill in Congress, which the House is expected to pass this week and the Senate will take up next week in committee.

#### Obama will veto any attempt to undo sequester

Shira Schoenberg, 5-29-2012, “Sen. Scott Brown opposes pending cuts,” Mass Live, http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2012/05/sen\_scott\_brown\_opposes\_pendin.html

The debate over sequestration has been stalled, as members from both parties agree it is unlikely Congress will be able to accomplish anything before the November election. Mackenzie Eaglen, a resident fellow at the conservative-leaning American Enterprise Institute, said the effects of the proposed cuts will start to be felt this summer when the Department of Defense must develop a plan in anticipation of potential cuts, resulting in possible furloughs or a hesitancy to invest in defense projects. House Republicans proposed a bill that would cut social programs such as food stamps instead of defense, and President Barack Obama has said he will veto it. Eaglen said senators have been working on proposals in closed-door sessions, but no plan has been released. “People are paying lip service to no one wants sequestration to happen, but at the same time, the Senate has not and will not move any bill with a proposal to alter it,” Eaglen said.

#### Auto cuts are safe—Obama will veto any reversal and dems will fight

Jeremy Herb, Staff Writer, 12-15-2011, “House Democrats blast GOP efforts to avoid automatic defense cuts,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/budget-approriations/199697-house-dems-trash-gop-efforts-to-change-defense-sequestration-cuts

House Democrats on Thursday panned Republican efforts to change the automatic cuts to defense spending, beginning a contentious debate that’s set to play out over the next year. Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.), Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.) said Wednesday they will propose legislation early next year that would stop sequestration defense cuts, while House Armed Services Committee Chairman Buck McKeon (R-Calif.) introduced a bill to kill the first year of cuts to both defense and non-defense spending. House Democrats responded Thursday with a letter signed by 92 members supporting President Obama’s veto threat if Congress tries to avoid the $600 billion in defense cuts without replacing them. Just as the debate in the supercommittee stalled over raising taxes, the fight over changing the defense cuts will be waged over how to mix spending cuts and raising revenues to cut $1 trillion from the budget. Rep. Peter Welch (D-Vt.), who circulated the letter, acknowledged that many Democrats agree the automatic defense cuts should be lessened, but said that new revenues had to be included in the conversation.

### No Spending – AT: Foreign Aid Now

#### Massive aid cuts coming

John Norris, executive director of the Center for American Progress’ sustainable security and peacebuilding initiative, 2-9-2012, “What should we expect from the President’s 2013 assistance budget?” http://www.modernizeaid.net/2012/02/09/what-should-we-expect-from-the-presidents-2013-assistance-budget/

It is a reasonable negotiating strategy, although it may prove to be a poor management decision. Looking at our relative fiscal health as a country, it seems almost inescapable that eventually there will be steep cuts in our foreign affairs spending as part of some grand bargain (however begrudging) that includes both spending cuts and revenue increases. We will likely see few signs of this in the President’s budget request, which will read very much as a status quo request where we see shifts in emphasis, but no dramatic headlines. For those of us who care about effective assistance programs and the health of the U.S. economy, this amounts to whistling past the graveyard and hoping for the best.

#### Aid to Tunisia needs to be approved – wont happen

Shaun Tandon, staff writer, 3-29-2012, “US to provide $100 million to Tunisia,” AFP, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hEu6OAJ6GKNrPCUlfHQ2AreDbt1w?docId=CNG.986cfcc24d5cff1f983c8f37ea3af555.61

WASHINGTON — The United States said Thursday it would grant $100 million to Tunisia to pay its debts, hoping to let the government focus on the economy and show a success in the birthplace of the Arab Spring. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said the United States was also negotiating a separate package in which Washington would offer loan guarantees to raise hundreds of millions of dollars in capital for Tunisia. Clinton, who spoke by telephone Wednesday with Prime Minister Hamadi Jebali, said the aid would let Tunisia pare down debts to the World Bank and African Development Bank left over from dictator Zine El Abidine Ben Ali's 23-year regime. The $100 million US cash transfer will allow Tunisia "to instead use this money for its priority programs, accelerating economic growth and job creation," Clinton said in a statement. "As Tunisia progresses into the next phase of its historic democratic transition, the United States is working to help accelerate economic growth that benefits all, ensure that democracy delivers for the Tunisian people, and to help Tunisian businesses -- large and small -- become engines of job creation," Clinton said. "We call on other partners in the international community to join us in supporting Tunisia and ensuring economic opportunities for more Tunisian people," she said. The grant still needs approval from Congress. Many lawmakers, particularly from the Republican Party which controls the House of Representatives, are skeptical of foreign aid and have voiced alarm over Islamism in the Arab world.

#### Foreign aid will be cut in the squo

John Norris, the Executive Director of the Sustainable Security and Peacebuilding Initiative at the Center for American Progress, 10-11-2011, “Foreign Aid Cuts Can Be Reasonable”, US News, http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/given-the-current-deficit-crisis-should-foreign-aid-be-cut/foreign-aid-cuts-can-be-reasonable-foreign-aid-cuts-can-be-reasonable

Even though foreign aid makes up only about 1 percent of the total federal budget, it is impossible to imagine that it will not be cut given the harrowing overall budget situation. And that is reasonable. The challenge will be to avoid cutting so deeply that we actually undermine our long-term national interests, such as helping the poorest of the poor, combating disease, establishing better disaster early warning systems, or creating tomorrow's markets for American industry. [Read more about the deficit and national debt.] How we go about implementing these cuts may be every bit as important as their overall scale. The worst approach would be to simply lop off the same percentage from all aid programs equally. Instead, we need to use these budget pressures to be much more selective in how we deliver aid and who we deliver it to. That means Congress needs to have the discipline to set aside pet projects like our assistance to Ireland and subsidies for the maritime industry that make it much more expensive to deliver lifesaving humanitarian assistance. The administration will need to do its part as well, and large expensive programs like aid to Pakistan will be under fierce scrutiny given the often troubling behavior of the Pakastani government. Increasing numbers of countries in Eastern Europe and Latin America simply no longer need U.S. assistance and some, like Brazil, are becoming donors themselves.

### Link – Sacred Cow

#### Fiat kills sequestration—the process requires every sector to be eligible for cuts

Todd Harrison and Barry Watts, senior fellows at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 12-13-2011, “DOD must protect industrial base from cuts,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1211/70369.html

This new fiscal reality will require hard choices. The department will have to rethink its roles and missions, adjust its strategy and target budget cuts accordingly. But even if cuts are targeted and informed by strategy, the timing of sequestration and the abruptness with which cuts must be implemented further constrain DoD’s options. It takes time to reduce personnel costs, close bases and implement efficiencies — many of which will likely prove ephemeral. This means that weapon systems funding could be hit hardest — which could adversely affect the defense industrial base and, ultimately, jobs. But the hardest choices may not be what to cut but what to keep. Washington cannot, and should not, protect all sectors of the domestic defense industry, nor can it assume that the defense industry will always be ready to produce whatever national security requires.

#### Fiat kills sequestration—creates sacred cows which mean no sequestration

Trish Turner, Staff Writer, 12-13-2011, “Republicans Poised to Unravel Mandatory Defense Cuts,” Fox News, http://politics.blogs.foxnews.com/2011/12/13/republicans-poised-unravel-mandatory-defense-cuts

Democratic leaders, by and large, oppose the effort to unravel the defense sequester, which was triggered by Congress' inability to find common ground on spending cuts and revenue increases. And Democratic leadership aides have said the defense cuts, when spread out over 10 years, are merely a fraction of DOD's overall budget, essentially about $55 billion a year. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., issued a statement after the super committee flop, saying, "The sequester was designed to be painful, and it is. But that is the commitment to fiscal responsibility that both parties made to the American people. In the absence of a balanced plan that would reduce the deficit by at least as much, I will oppose any efforts to change or roll back the sequester." So far, no such "balanced plan" has materialized. A similar set of mandatory cuts will hit a number of Democratic sacred cows, like education and healthcare. As yet, there appears to be no similar effort afoot to scrap those cuts. But Republicans are determined that DOD will not take the hit. Across the Capitol, House Armed Services Committee Chairman Buck McKeon, R-Calif., has also vowed that he "will not let these sequestration cuts stand" and has said he will soon introduce legislation to that effect. One thing is certain, the fight over defense funds will carry into a hotly-contested election. What happens then is anyone's guess.

#### Fiat turns the trigger option into a paper tiger – can’t be cut

David Welna, staff writer, 10-3-2011, “Debt Committee's Fail-Safe Might Already Be Undone,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/2011/10/03/140998884/debt-committees-failsafe-might-already-be-undone?ps=rs

"It's all hypothetical, but if a trigger were in effect, you would see an immediate action on the floor of both houses by those of us who are not ready to see the dismantling of our defense establishment," McCain said. If across-the-board spending cuts were triggered, they would be spread out over a decade and not even begin until January 2013. That would leave lawmakers plenty of time to undo this consequence for inaction that is now written into law, according to GOP strategist and former top Republican aide Ron Bonjean. "It sounds great at the time when you make a deal, like on the debt [ceiling]," Bonjean said. "But when it actually comes down the pike, and if Congress has something to do about it, they may be [like] Lucy trying to take the football away from Charlie Brown." And the less Congress believes such a spending cut trigger would really be carried out, the less reason the supercommittee has to reach a deal.

### Link – Chopping Block

#### Everything has to be on the chopping block to enforce fiscal discipline

Donna Cassata, Staff Writer, 4-13-2011, “Budget Cuts In Deal Hit Defense Spending, Foreign Aid”, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/13/budget-cuts-foreign-aid\_n\_848535.html

Tea partyers insistent on cutting military spending and foreign aid will find plenty to like in the deal struck by President Barack Obama and congressional leaders. No money for an alternative engine for the multibillion-dollar Joint Strike Fighter. Millions of dollars in cuts for the United Nations. A major reduction in spending on the Global Agriculture and Food Security Fund. It all adds up to billions less for the Pentagon and the State Department than what Obama had requested for the budget year ending Sept. 30, a reflection of the widespread congressional belief that every element of government spending is on the chopping block in an era of trillion-dollar-plus deficits. The hard-fought deal negotiated by the president, House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., calls for $513 billion for defense, a cut of $18.1 billion from what the administration envisioned but $5 billion more than last year's amount. War costs for Iraq and Afghanistan would be covered separately at a cost of $158 billion. The State Department and foreign operations would get $48.3 billion, an $8.4 billion reduction from Obama's proposal and a cut of $504 million from last year. The House and Senate are expected to vote this week on the overall package of $38 billion in cuts. The alternative engine was the target of a battle cry for cost-cutting Republican newcomers in February. House GOP freshmen led the charge to cancel $450 million for a second engine for the nearly 2,500 F-35 fighters the Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps plan to buy and fly over the next 40 years. Neither Obama nor Defense Secretary Robert Gates wanted the second engine, with Gates telling Congress that it required an additional $3 billion to develop and that spending such money "in a time of economic distress" was a waste. But Boehner and other House GOP leaders backed the extra engine built by General Electric and Rolls Royce in Ohio and Indiana. Fears that it would be revived in the compromise bill proved unfounded. "Given the overwhelming bipartisan support my amendment enjoyed in the House, I appreciate Speaker Boehner and Majority Leader Reid including this cut in the final agreement they negotiated," said two-term Rep. Tom Rooney, R-Fla. "The extra engine is a luxury we simply cannot afford." Said Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, a member of the Armed Services Committee: "Not only did they not fund the alternate engine ... but they rescinded money from a previous year. I thought that represented the kind of elimination of duplicative spending that we need to address."

#### Perception link – Congress has to be perceived as truly committed – every program is key

Donna Cassata, Staff Writer, 4-13-2011, “Budget Cuts In Deal Hit Defense Spending, Foreign Aid”, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/13/budget-cuts-foreign-aid\_n\_848535.html

Last month, the Pentagon ordered a halt to work on the second engine. It plans to buy engines solely from Pratt & Whitney of Hartford, Conn. Still, officials in the defense industry say proponents of the alternative engine may try to restore the money in future military budgets, long after Gates has retired as defense secretary. In the interim, the company would use its own money to try to keep the production line open. In February, Gates said his bottom line number for the defense budget was $540 billion, tens of billions more than what the White House and congressional leaders worked out. Sen. Jack Reed, D-R.I., a member of the Armed Services Committee, said resolution was critical. "The most important thing is getting a budget for the year. It lowers the level of uncertainty," Reed said. "The consequences of not having a budget are delay and maybe even deferring important projects at a cost of more money. It's very inefficient." But he added that if lawmakers are "truly committed to reducing the deficit," they have to look at every program. The bill calls for cuts in 759 defense programs. Consistent with recent defense legislation, the bill bars the transfer of terrorist suspects held at the Navy-run prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United State and prevents construction of facilities in the U.S. to house detainees. On foreign aid, the White House and congressional leaders agreed to significant across-the-board cuts. The U.S. contribution to the United Nations and other international organizations would be cut by $377 million. Pay for foreign service officers would be frozen. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Fund, created to fight world hunger and poverty, would get just $100 million, far less than the $408 million than Obama sought. The negotiators agreed to cuts in the millions for international banks, the U.N. Population Fund and international narcotics control and law enforcement programs.

### Link – Earmarks

#### Plan will get marked up with earmarks – costs billions more

Ron Nixon, Staff Writer New York Times, 9-27-2010, “Lawmakers Finance Pet Projects Without Earmarks”, Center for a New American Security, http://www.cnas.org/node/5527

Mr. Flake said he had raised the issue with Mr. Boehner, adding, “I’m confident that he heard me and will address these things, too.” Soft earmarks alone accounted for billions of dollars in spending in 2006, the last year they were examined, according the Congressional Research Service. They occur most often in spending bills for State Department, the United States Agency for International Development and other foreign aid programs. In 2010, the soft earmarks included suggestions to finance the Esperanza International, a micro-lending organization based in Washington State that was started by David Valle, a former major league baseball player, and the Real Property Foundation, a group in Chicago made up of American real estate agents that promotes private property rights around the world. Patrick M. Cronin, a senior adviser at the Center for a New American Security and a former administrator at the Agency for International Development, said soft earmarks were commonly used by members of Congress, especially appropriators. “They would tell you that they wanted money to go to a particular university or group or the next time you wouldn’t get the funding in the budget you wanted,” Dr. Cronin said. “So it’s true that you can ignore6 some soft earmarks, but others you have to take more seriously. Agency heads are not going to put their budgets in jeopardy because of a few line items.”

#### Pork spending kills government’s ability to reduce the deficit

Richard Farr, Staff Writer, 9-7-2011, “7 Common Sense Ideas to Fix America's Financial Crisis”, http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/8368517/7\_common\_sense\_ideas\_to\_fix\_americas.html?cat=3

The problem with the financial situation of America is founded on the incompetence of our politicians in their failure to understand economics, general accounting, and business practices. If any business or even taxpayer ran their company or home like our politicians run the Federal government, we would be bankrupt and homeless by the end of the year. It is unconscionable that they continue to act so irresponsible in the face of this financial crisis in America. However, it is not unexpected as most, if not all, politicians are millionaires, therefore have no clue what living paycheck to paycheck means. The root cause of our financial situation is the blatant spending on pet projects, foreign aid, corporate subsidies, unnecessary bailouts, excessive waste, and fraud. Most of this is unregulated with no oversight. The lack of common sense decision-making is overwhelming in Washington. Americans are already at their financial breaking point yet Washington is suggesting we need to raise taxes to bail out the country because of the foolish decisions they made. Accusations that Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare costs are too high and need to be overhauled is just a smoke screen to cover up the real problem. What is eating up America's budget is the mismanagement of revenue and underhanded additions the politicians add into bills to fund various pork projects they want.

#### Earmarks will be airdropped on to the plan

Kirsten B. Mitchell, 10-11-2008, “Congress Skirts Earmark Rules With Airdrop Add-ons,” The Ledger, http://www.theledger.com/article/20081011/news/810060395

In the 20 months since U.S. House and Senate leaders promised greater transparency, Congress has repeatedly skirted its own rules and tucked into mammoth, must-pass bills nearly $2 billion in secretive earmarks. The provisions, known as airdrops, fund or authorize funding for pet projects and include $750,000 to equip a Florida children's hospital to fully operate on a generator during an emergency; $1 million for an Alabama town to shore up a flood-prone road; and $6.9 million for a North Carolina company to install wireless surveillance at airports along the U.S. border. The airdropping process works like this: After the House and Senate pass a bill, a committee of lawmakers is picked to iron out differences. Rules ban slipping new earmarks or provisions into the final version. But negotiators toss them in, knowing that the rules can be disregarded with a procedural motion when the House and Senate vote on the final bill. "We have pretty good rules," said Rep. Jeff Flake, R- Ariz. "But every rule we have can be waived, and we do." Airdropping is quick and secretive, said Steve Ellis, vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, a federal budget watchdog. "There is virtually no accountability if you airdrop (earmarks) in," he said. "There is not an opportunity to scrutinize them because things go like greased lightning between the conference committee and the House, and the House and the Senate."

### Spending 🡪 Ratings Downgrade

#### Unexpected spending tanks the credit rating

Karen Dunn Kelley, Senior Managing Director of Invesco, 2011, “A U.S. default is averted, but the work is not over”, Invesco Insights, https://www.invesco.ca/publicPortal/ShowDoc?nodePath=/BEA%20Repository/common/document/pdf/Deficits\_Debt\_Ceiling.pdf

The Budget Control Act of 2011 has been signed into law, raising the U.S. debt ceiling and forging a path for long-term deficit reductions. We applaud Congress and the White House for avoiding a default, which we believe could have triggered enormous unintended consequences. We also recognize that the work is not over. The legislation outlines $917 billion in deficit reduction between 2012 and 2021, to be achieved through caps on domestic and defense spending. It also creates a bipartisan committee to identify another $1.2 trillion to $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction, potentially including spending cuts, entitlement reform and tax reform. The committee must recommend its deficit reduction proposal by Nov. 23, and Congress is required to vote on it by Dec. 23. If a reduction is not agreed upon by the deadline, automatic procedures will be triggered that reduce spending by as much as $1.2 trillion, starting Jan. 15, 2012. Half of the cuts would come from national security and defense. Medicare would receive limited cuts, but Social Security and Medicaid would be exempt. Bottom line: Deficit reduction should total between $2.1 trillion and $2.4 trillion over 10 years. Waiting for the ratings Once the deal was signed, the question turned to the reaction of the three ratings agencies — Standard & Poor’s, Moody’s Investors Service and Fitch Ratings — and whether they would maintain the country’s AAA credit rating, the highest rating possible. At the end of the day Tuesday, Moody’s issued a press release confirming the country’s Aaa government bond rating, with a negative outlook. Moody’s noted that the debt deal has ‘virtually eliminated” the risk of default. In assigning its negative outlook, Moody’s said there would be a risk of downgrade if any of the following occur: • There is a weakening in fiscal discipline in the coming year • Further fiscal consolidation measures are not adopted in 2013 • The economic outlook deteriorates significantly • There ¡s an appreciable rise in the U.S. government’s funding costs over and above what is currently expected

#### Ability to reduce debt in the future is key to avoid a downgrade

Richard Cowan and Walter Brandimarte, Staff Writers Reuters, 9-27-2011, “Calculating the odds of a U.S. deficit deal”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/09/27/us-usa-debt-idUSTRE78Q5AA20110927?feedType=RSS&feedName=topNews&rpc=71

The super committee finds a way to thread the needle and get enough votes to back a mix of spending cuts and some revenue increases that total $1.2 trillion over a decade. The revenue increases probably would be sold as closing tax loopholes. Ending a special break for ethanol blenders that is set to expire at the end of the year anyway is a possible example. While not total failure, this would be a disappointment to ratings agencies looking for a more ambitious product. Their rating decisions would probably depend on the chances of further deficit-reduction measures in the future and on the performance of the economy.

#### Extra spending forces cuts—makes compromise impossible and kills debt reduction

Russell Berman, Staff Writer, 9-8-2011, “Debt panel co-chairman Hensarling criticizes Obama plan to pay for jobs proposal”, The Hill, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/180487-debt-panel-co-chair-criticizes-obama-jobs-proposal

The Republican co-chairman of the congressional supercommittee on deficit reduction sharply criticized President Obama’s call for the panel to find additional budget savings to pay for his $447 billion jobs plan. “By asking the Joint Select Committee to increase the $1.5 trillion target to cover the full cost of his plan, the president is essentially tasking a committee designed to reduce the deficit to pay for yet another round of stimulus,” Rep. Jeb Hensarling (R-Texas) said in a news release after the president’s Thursday night speech to a joint session of Congress. The 12-member committee is tasked with finding $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years as part of an agreement to lift the federal debt ceiling. Obama on Thursday urged the panel “to increase that amount so that it covers the full cost of the American Jobs Act,” the proposal he introduced during his speech. “Deficit reduction is part of job creation,” Hensarling said. “This proposal would make the already-arduous challenge of finding bipartisan agreement on deficit reduction nearly impossible, removing our options for deficit reduction for a plan that won’t reduce the deficit by one penny. It’s not the role of this committee to spend more money we don’t have on jobs we don’t get.”

### Debt Reduction Key To Rating

#### Effectively reducing the deficit is key to avoid a credit downgrade

Gail Russell Chaddock, Staff writer, 10-4-2011, “Congress's new brinkmanship: Better or worse than politics as usual?”, The Christian Science Monitor, Lexis 10/8

Congress usually deals with raising the national debt limit by criticizing the president and then passing a bill with as little fanfare as possible. It would be inconceivable for any Congress to jeopardize the full faith and credit of the US, said officials from both Republican and Democratic administrations. In fact, Congress had raised the national debt ceiling 78 times since 1960, 49 times at the request of Republican presidents and 30 at the behest of Democrats. But many House GOP freshmen had pledged to oppose raising the $14.3 trillion national debt limit by even a dime. Boehner declared on May 9 that no increase would clear the House unless the legislation included spending cuts equal to the size of the debt-limit increase - and no tax hikes. Then, he stuck to it. The House tied a higher debt ceiling to a "cut, cap, and balance" bill, which would require Congress to cut current spending, cap future spending, and pass a balanced budget amendment to the US Constitution. Senate majority leader Harry Reid (D) of Nevada dubbed the bill "weak and senseless ... perhaps the worst legislation in the history of this country." Democrats said any big plan to shrink debt and deficits should include tax hikes and shared sacrifice. Moreover, they said, the hike in the debt limit was for spending that Congress had already authorized, and Congress had an obligation to cover its checks. With the US government on the brink of default, Congress on Aug. 2 approved a debt-limit hike that met Boehner's terms. But the drama alarmed world financial markets. On Aug. 5, the US lost its top-tier AAA credit rating, in part because of concern that Congress was not capable of getting the nation onto sound fiscal footing. Public approval plummeted, too.

#### Failure to reduce the deficit tanks the credit rating—political compromise is on the brink

Patrick J. O'Hare, the Chief Market Analyst for Briefing Research, 10-3-2011, “Briefing.com: Market View”, Breifing.com, Lexis 10//8

We have a big deficit problem but everyone already knows that. President Obama has acknowledged it; Congressional leaders have acknowledged it; Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has acknowledged it; Treasury Secretary Geithner has acknowledged it; the IMF has acknowledged it; the G20 has acknowledged it; and anyone reading the news has been made aware of it. The rub of course is that no one has come up with an agreeable solution. Finally, some plans are being presented where the blueprint for cutting the deficit over the long-term is couched in terms of trillions of dollars and not billions of dollars, and where the need to reform entitlement programs is entering the conversation. Still, politicians on both sides of the aisle are muddying the outlook with the same denunciations of the other party's plan that make a compromise seem unlikely at this point. Risks: Congress fails to agree to raise debt ceiling -- a low probability, very high risk scenario. Failure to reach credible compromise to cut long-term deficit risks inviting a downgrade of the U.S. AAA credit rating, which would lead to a higher cost of borrowing. Budget shortfalls at local, state, and federal level raise the specter of major spending cutbacks and higher taxes that can adversely affect economic growth. Potential for class warfare (middle class/poor vs. rich), age warfare (young vs. old), and worker warfare (private vs. public) builds with need for fiscal reform.

#### Fitch rates AAA now but sequestration is key to maintaining the rating

Eyder Peralta, staff writer, 12-22-2011, “Fitch: U.S. Needs To Get Its Financials In Order, Or Face Downgrade,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2011/12/22/144136643/fitch-u-s-needs-to-get-its-financials-in-order-or-face-downgrade

The credit rating agency Fitch Ratings has issued another warning to Washington. If it doesn't come up with a plan to reduce the nation's budget deficit, Fitch might yank its AAA rating by the end of next year. "Without such a strategy, the sovereign rating will likely be lowered," Fitch said in a statement today, according to Bloomberg. "Agreement will also have to be reached on raising the federal debt ceiling, which is expected to become binding in the first half of 2013." Fitch had already assigned the U.S. a negative outlook in November. And as you may remember, Standard & Poor's slashed the country's credit rating to AA-plus in August. Bloomberg has a bit from an analyst about what all this means: "'The debt situation is a slow moving train wreck,' said Jason Brady, a managing director at Thornburg Investment Management Inc., which oversees about $73 billion from Santa Fe, New Mexico. 'The risks are apparent, but the benefits or strengths are also apparent. The strength of the U.S economy, the strength of the U.S financial system, is more apparent right now.'"

### Sequestration Key Rating

#### Sequestration is key to the AAA rating

Daniel Bases, Staff Writer, 12-22-2011, “Fitch Warns U.S. Of Credit Downgrade Unless Debt Problem Is Solved,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/12/22/fitch-warns-us-credit-downgrade-debt-problem-solved\_n\_1164972.html

Fitch Ratings on Wednesday warned again that the United States' rising debt burden was not consistent with maintaining the country's top AAA credit rating, but said there would likely be no decision on whether to cut the rating before 2013. Last month, Fitch changed its U.S. credit rating outlook to negative from stable, citing the failure of a special congressional committee to agree on at least $1.2 trillion in deficit-reduction measures. "Federal debt will rise in the absence of expenditure and tax reforms that would address the challenges of rising health and social security spending as the population ages," Fitch said in a statement. "The high and rising federal and general government debt burden is not consistent with the U.S. retaining its 'AAA' status despite its other fundamental sovereign credit strengths," the ratings agency said. In a new fiscal projection, Fitch said at least $3.5 trillion of additional deficit reduction measures will be required to stabilize the federal debt held by the public at around 90 percent of gross domestic product in the latter half of the current decade. Fitch, when it lowered its outlook to negative, had said it was giving the U.S. government until 2013 to come up with a "credible plan" to tackle its ballooning budget deficit or risk a downgrade from the AAA status. "A key task of an incoming Congress and administration in 2013 is to formulate a credible plan to reduce the budget deficit and stabilize the federal debt burden. Without such a strategy, the sovereign rating will likely be lowered by the end of 2013," Fitch reiterated. Rival ratings agency Standard & Poor's cut its credit rating on the United States to AA-plus from AAA on August 5, citing concerns over the government's budget deficit and rising debt burden as well as the political gridlock that nearly led to a default. On November 23, Moody's Investors Service, warned that its top level Aaa credit rating for the United States could be in jeopardy if lawmakers were to backtrack on $1.2 trillion in automatic deficit cuts that are set to be made over 10 years. The plan for automatic cuts was triggered after the special congressional committee failed to reach an agreement on deficit reduction. Moody's said any pullback from the agreed automatic cuts to take effect starting in 2013 could prompt it to take action.

#### AAA now but the sequestration process is key to the rating

John Detrixhe, Staff Writer, 12-21-2011, “U.S. Faces 2013 Fitch AAA Downgrade Unless Deficit Cuts Made,” San Francisco Chronicle, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2011/12/21/bloomberg\_articlesLWKO3Y0D9L35.DTL

The U.S.'s AAA rating will probably be cut by Fitch Ratings by the end of 2013 unless lawmakers are able to formulate a plan to reduce the budget deficit after next year's congressional and presidential elections. "Without such a strategy, the sovereign rating will likely be lowered," New York-based Fitch said in a statement today. "Agreement will also have to be reached on raising the federal debt ceiling, which is expected to become binding in the first half of 2013." Fitch assigned a negative outlook on the U.S. in November after a congressional committee failed to agree on budget cuts. The rating firm forecast federal public-debt will exceed 90 percent of gross-domestic-product by the end of the decade unless the government addresses rising health and social security spending through tax increases or reductions in expenditures. "The debt situation is a slow moving train wreck," said Jason Brady, a managing director at Thornburg Investment Management Inc., which oversees about $73 billion from Santa Fe, New Mexico. "The risks are apparent, but the benefits or strengths are also apparent. The strength of the U.S economy, the strength of the U.S financial system, is more apparent right now."

### Credit Downgrade Hurts Economy

#### A decreased credit rating causes economic collapse

Marc Goldwein, senior policy analyst for the fiscal policy program at the New America Foundation and was Associate Director of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, 8-11-2011, “Drawing a AAA-Road Map for Post-Downgrade America”, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2011/08/drawing-a-aaa-road-map-for-post-downgrade-america/243463/

What are the consequences of further downgrades? The most direct one could be higher interest rates, as investors insist on a risk premium. Even a 0.1 percent increase in interest rates would mean an additional $130 billion in government spending on interest over the next 10 years that we would have to offset in hiring taxes or fewer investments to meet the same debt goal. A 0.7% increase in interest rates would be enough to erase all of the gains from the recent debt deal. In addition, higher interest rates could reverberate throughout the market, impacting everything from mortgages to small business loans - and ultimately leading to something economists call "crowd out," where fewer dollars go into growth-driving investments. The biggest concern, though, should be that these rating downgrades could advance the day of a fiscal crisis. At some point, if we don't make some changes, investors will lose confidence in our nation's ability to make good on its debt. When that occurs, it is possible we could experience a global economic crisis akin to the financial crisis of 2009, except with no one available to bail out the U.S. government.

#### A ratings decline causes economic collapse

Rep. Phil Gingery (GA), M.D. Medical College of Georgia, 9-1-2011, “Real Economic Recovery Demands a Balanced Budget Amendment”, Economic Crisis.US, http://economiccrisis.us/2011/09/real-economic-recovery-demands-balanced-budget-amendment/

For the first time in our country’s history, our credit rating was downgraded from its AAA standing to a AA+ rating. This has many repercussions – instability in U.S. and international markets, uncertainty for businesses and investors, and the erosion of consumer confidence. These ramifications are profound, but instead of discouraging the American people, they should serve as a wakeup call and a reminder of the heavy lifting needed in the weeks and months ahead if we’re to clean up this mess. Simply put, this downgrade is the final indicator that Washington’s spending spree must end, not just because House Republicans think so, but for the first time in our history one of the world’s leading credit-rating agencies does too. Standard & Poor’s (S&P) downgraded the United States credit primarily because the government failed to provide policies necessary to stabilize its debt payments. Although the recent deal struck by Congress and President Obama provides a down payment on reducing the debt, there is still a long road ahead to recovery. What’s worse, if there are not more substantial reductions in spending over the next few years, they could downgrade our standing again, sending another round of shock waves through the global markets and sinking our own economy further into recession. The bottom line is that we need more effective policies that will ensure the efforts made to cut spending today aren’t undone by politicians in the future.

### Credit Downgrade Hurts Economy

#### Decreases in fiscal discipline mean S and P downgrade crushes the economy

Motoko Rich, and Graham Bowley, Staff Writers, 8-7-2011, “Markets Expected Credit Ruling, but Risks Remain, Analysts Say”, The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/07/business/how-the-sp-downgrade-of-united-states-credit-rating-will-affect-the-country.html?\_r=1&scp=1&sq=If%20the%20political%20%E2%80%A6%20mortgage%20rates.&st=cse

“If the political situation does not improve past the next election and the fiscal situation gets worse, then people might start to agree with S.& P.’s decision,” said Ajay Rajadhyaksha, head of United States fixed income strategy at Barclays Capital in New York. “If investors around the world then start shunning Treasuries, diversifying away from the U.S. dollar, that will show up in higher yields” — and higher mortgage rates.

### AT: Econ Resilient

#### Past resilience no longer applies – housing bubble eliminated shock absorbers

Jon Hilsenrath and Sara Murray, 7-30-2011, “Economy Losing Its Cushion,” WSJ, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111903591104576468462275889544.html

The resilience of the U.S. economy, which rebounded from wars, terror attacks and a crash in tech stocks in the past quarter century, has been weakened in the aftermath of the housing bust, and shock absorbers that cushioned blows in the past are no longer working. View Interactive The government on Friday reported that the economy grew at a rate of just 1.3% in the second quarter, failing to bounce back from knocks earlier in the year. Estimates of first-quarter growth were also revised down to 0.4%. As a result, the pace of economic recovery has been one of the worst since World War II, weaker than all but the short-lived recovery of the early 1980s. That's particularly bad news as the economy confronts the threat of a default on the nation's debt. Among the reasons the economy is so vulnerable: Debt-laden consumers with scant savings are prone to slash spending when their incomes drop. Household confidence is more fragile. Individuals are moving less often to find jobs, making it harder for firms to fill vacancies. And the government, for decades the rescuer of last resort with interest-rate cuts, tax reductions and spending increases, has run out of string. The manufacturing sector was supposed to be one of the economy's stronger segments, but a weak ISM manufacturing report suggests that the U.S. economy is still fragile, WSJ's Jon Hilsenrath reports. (Photo: AP Photo.) Economists label the late 1980s, 1990s and early 2000s "The Great Moderation," a period in which the ups and downs of the economy were muted. That epoch is over. James Stock, a Harvard economist who helped coin that label, says that the volatility of economic output, income and consumption looks more like it did 25 years ago. "In this recession and its aftermath, those smoothing mechanisms, those shock absorbers, clearly have been damaged," he says.

#### Poor growth momentum undermines the resilience of the US economy

Vincent R. Reinhart, former dir. FRB Monetary Affairs, AEI scholar, 8-23-2011, “Is the US economy freefalling?” American Enterprise Inst., http://www.aei.org/article/economics/fiscal-policy/is-the-us-economy-freefalling/

In a paper called "After the Fall" presented at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City's Jackson Hole Symposium last year, my wife Carmen and I looked at the experience surrounding the fifteen worst financial crises in the second half of the twentieth century.[2] The bitter message is that economies persistently perform poorly after a wrenching crash in financial markets and shock to banks. This Outlook will review that territory to provide perspective about the current position and the likely trajectory of the US economy. Precedent predicts that economic activity will expand at a pace insufficient to make much progress in reducing the unemployment rate. This sizable resource slack should help hold inflation steady in the face of depreciation of the exchange value of the dollar. An economy not generating much momentum is less resilient to adverse shocks. And with the current backdrop of multiple European governments teetering on the brink of default, investors still backpedalling from risk, and US politicians itching for the next fight, adverse shocks loom especially ominous. That said, firms have liquid balance sheets and equity markets are providing remarkably high earnings relative to their prices. Economic expansion could be rejuvenated, but it will likely have to come from within, as US policymakers are unlikely to provide a spark from outside. Netting across the various risks and factoring in this policy inertia, the chance that the economy slips into another recession within a year is about four in ten.

#### Slow growth eliminates the resilience of the US economy

Vincent R. Reinhart, former dir. FRB Monetary Affairs, AEI scholar, 8-23-2011, “Is the US economy freefalling?” American Enterprise Inst., http://www.aei.org/article/economics/fiscal-policy/is-the-us-economy-freefalling/

An economy expanding at a subpar rate is less resilient in the face of adverse shocks. That is, the country's economy is a plane flying slowly and close to the ground. This combination makes wind shear and pilot error more consequential. Indeed, in seven of the fifteen cases studied in "After the Fall," economies suffered what could reasonably be called two recessions in the decade after the crisis.[4] The US economy is flying over a landscape with a high risk of wind shear. Among the sources of concern is the uncertain status of several European governments that may hit the wall of a sudden stop of external credit. Such an event, or official action to informally restructure outstanding debt, could call into question the viability of some large European banks. A replay, if only fainter, of the events of the 2008 fall would lead investors to withdraw even more from risk taking, taking another dent out of wealth.

### AT: S&P Already Downgraded US

#### Downgrades by two agencies force a massive sell off of US bonds

Jessica Irvine, Economics Staff Writer, 8-8-2011, “Rating cut won't count for much”, Sidney Morning Herald, http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/rating-cut-wont-count-for-much-20110807-1ihqo.html

It's a conclusion available to even the most casual observer of US politics and the reckless debate about lifting the US government's debt ceiling. Indeed, conservative Tea Party forces openly advocate the US government should do just that, and default on its debts. But even so, Friday's downgrade represents the opinion of just one of three major credit rating agencies. Moody's still rates it as AAA - the highest rating available - as does Fitch. Crucially, this means investors governed by investment rules stipulating they must only hold AAA rated assets are unlikely to be forced to sell their Treasury bonds and push up the cost of US borrowing. Similarly, the biggest foreign holders of US Treasury bonds, China and Japan, are unlikely to sell out of US bonds altogether. What would they buy instead? Indeed, perversely, by heightening market jitters, S&P's downgrading of US government debt might spark an investor flight towards US Treasury bonds, increasing their price and lowering the yield payable on US borrowing, as investors seek the comfort of their old safe haven. International investors have demonstrated a certain Stockholm syndrome-like relationship with US assets, falling in love with the very currency and bonds of the country that has caused them so much trouble in the first place. Having clung to the apron strings of the US government in times of uncertainty for decades, this could prove a hard habit to break. That is why the US dollar tends to rally in times of uncertainty (US bonds must be bought in US currency). This will limit any increase in US government debt servicing costs. So in the short term, the credit downgrade potentially means next to nothing. However, from a longer term perspective, the embarrassing removal of the US government's prized AAA rating says everything. It serves as a stark reminder that the situation is bleak. The US economy is staring down the barrel of, at worst, another recession and, at best, a lost decade of sluggish growth and high unemployment. In this context, events such as Friday's downgrade can quickly become a lightning rod for justifiably negative market sentiment towards the prospects for American and world growth

#### A second downgrade causes dollar dumping

Ken Frankel, managing member at KIF Capital Management, 8-10-2011, “Action In The Equities Markets More Important Than S&P”, Business Insider, http://www.businessinsider.com/action-in-the-equities-markets-more-important-than-sp-2011-8

As for the S&P credit rating issue, I don't expect rates to rise much because of this. Japan lost its AAA rating years ago and in fact, a decade ago S&P rated Japan sovereign debt lower than Botswana and look at how low rates are for Japanese bonds, they are lower than ours currently by some magnitude. My only concern would be if the rating changes triggered contractual actions, something I addressed in my latest blog entry. In most cases, and S&P rating change won't trigger an avalanche of events so long as Moody's retains a higher ratings because most mutual funds and other things driven by credit ratings are allowed to take the higher of a split rating. If Moody's follows S&P, we may have a larger problem.

#### The big three agencies outweigh others

Linda McMaken, Investopedia Writer, 10-24-2011, “The Scary Truth About Downgrades”, San Francisco Chronicle, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2011/10/24/investopedia62977.DTL

There are five major agencies that decide a country's credit worthiness: Fitch Ratings, Moody's, Standard & Poor's (S&P), Business Monitor International and CTRISKS. Of these, S&P, Fitch and Moody's are widely known and lead the others in their decisions. In essence, they determine how well a country can pay back its debt. Countries With Downgrades This year, for the first time in its history, the United States had its AAA rating downgraded by S&P. After the downgrade, S&P stated they'd made a mistake, but let it stand.

### Ratings Decrease Bad – Dollar Impact

#### Ratings decrease causes dollar sell-off – won’t happen now

Walter Brandimarte and Daniel Bases, Staff Writers Reuters, 8-6-2011, “United States loses prized AAA credit rating from S&P”, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/08/06/us-usa-debt-downgrade-idUSTRE7746VF20110806

The impact of S&P's move was tempered by Moody's Investors Service's decision earlier this week confirming, for now, the U.S. Aaa rating. Fitch Ratings said it was still reviewing its AAA rating and would issue its opinion by the end of the month. S&P's move is also likely to concern foreign creditors especially China, which holds more than $1 trillion of U.S. debt. Beijing has repeatedly urged Washington to protect its U.S. dollar investments by addressing its budget problems. "China will be forced to consider other investments for its reserves. U.S. Treasuries aren't as safe anymore," said Li Jie, a director at the reserves research institute at the Central University of Finance and Economics. One currency strategist, however, did not think there would be wholesale selling by foreigners. "One of the reasons we don't really think foreign investors will start selling U.S. Treasuries aggressively is because there are still few alternatives to the Treasury market in terms of depth and liquidity," said Vassili Serebriakov, currency strategist at Wells Fargo in New York. He said there was likely to be weakness in the U.S. dollar but a sharp sell-off was unlikely.

#### Now is key—markets are watching US action because of previous downgrade

Layna Mosley, Professor of international relations, international political economy, and comparative political economy UNC Chapel Hill, 8-6-2011, “From AAA to AA+: Markets, Governments and the Downgrade”, The Monkey Cage, http://themonkeycage.org/blog/2011/08/06/from-aaa-to-aa-markets-governments-and-the-downgrade/

Second, the S&P action reminds us that a specific assumption long held by markets – that the bonds issued by governments of wealthy countries are free from default risk – may be changing. In the early 2000s, I argued that governments of wealthy democracies have a good deal of policymaking autonomy vis-à-vis capital markets. As long as governments do well in terms of macro-outcomes, such as low inflation and small fiscal deficits, markets were content to charge them relatively low interest rates. Investors paid little attention to the finer details of government policies – how they allocated spending across categories, or whether left or right-leaning governments were in office. This was in marked contrast to the broader pressures that markets placed on governments of developing countries. In such places, a concern with default risk led to a greater set of pressures from private investors. But now, as it has become clear that membership in EMU does not lead necessarily to stable fiscal policies, and as some developed countries have deficit and debt levels that rival or exceed those of economies in Latin America, southeast Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, this easy shortcut – “developed country sovereign debt is safe”—may no longer apply. So some governments may find themselves more exposed to financial market pressures than in the past. And these governments could find that political events – including wrangling over a debt ceiling – provoke a greater market response than they once did. Whether this is a short-term pattern or a longer-term change remains to be seen.

#### Dollar collapse causes heg collapse

Chas Freeman Jr., retired diplomat, former Minister in Beijing and Bangkok, and ambassador to Saudi Arabia, and Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, 7-13-2011, “The Incapacitation of US Statecraft and Diplomacy,” The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, volume 6 page 413-432

The risks entailed in failing to meet these challenges are not trivial. At least one is almost existential. A dollar-based global monetary system that is long past its prime and overdue for correction cannot much longer sustain the spendthrift fiscal policies to which Americans have become accustomed.3 The inevitable adjustment to fiscal and monetary realities could include not just global financial collapse but the sudden decline of both US prosperity and the worldwide military power and political prestige that this has long underwritten. This linkage to the possibility of a dollar sovereign-debt crisis is well understood in the Pentagon,4 even if not reflected in fiscal and monetary policy or debate in the US Congress. It could bring on a sudden, radical reduction in US economic power and military prowess.

### Ratings Decrease Bad – Chinese Currency Impact

#### Credit downgrade causes Chinese currency appreciation

Jo Coghlan, PhD and lecturer in Australian Politics and International Relations at the School of Social Sciences and International Studies at the University of New South Wales, 8-9-2011, “U.S. Credit Rating: American Hegemony in Decline?”, Journal of Foreign Relations, http://www.jofr.org/2011/08/09/u-s-credit-rating-american-hegemony-in-decline/#.TqETmmt1l8F

A larger concern will be whether the appetite for U.S. debt might change among foreign investors, in particular China, the world’s largest foreign holder of U.S. Treasuries. In 1945, foreigners owned just 1 percent of US Treasuries. Today, they own a record high 46 percent. U.S. Treasury bonds, once undisputedly seen as the safest security in the world, are now rated lower than bonds issued by countries such as Britain, Germany, France, or Canada. Prior to the S&P decision, Dagong, China’s Global Credit Rating agency, had already pushed the U.S. rating from A+ to A, and placed the rating on negative watch (indicating the potential for a further cut). Other than the U.S. Federal Reserve, China is the biggest holder of American debt, with $1.16 trillion. It maintains the value of its currency through buying U.S dollars: a monetary policy that is likely to continue if only to protect its own currency. The downgrade, accompanied by a continuing weak U.S dollar, could affect Chinese exports and this will directly affect the Australian economy. Less demand for consumer goods in both the regional and global economy would directly lead to weaker demand for China’s exported goods; this then weakens demands for imports, particularly in the energy sector. If the Chinese currency appreciates as a response to the weakening U.S dollar, it will make Chinese goods more expensive. This will result in China shifting its focus away from export production to production for domestic consumption. With China continuing to buy U.S debt and shifting its focus to domestic economic production, the results will mean less Chinese currency floating in the regional and global economy. This coupled with contractions in Eurozone spending, bodes badly for any economy that is being driven by exports: as Australia currently is.

#### Revaluation hurts government efforts to solve the rich-poor gap – sparks instability

Nhu-Nguyen Ngo, Economist @ BNP, June-July 2005, “A difficult middle way,” Conjoncture,

http://economic-research.bnpparibas.com/applis/www/RechEco.nsf/0/A3C686E8B35688A4C12570490048F6AB/$FileC0506\_A2.pdf?OpenElement

Income inequalities are widening, not only between the rural and urban zones, but also between the still mostly underdeveloped interior of the country and the more dynamic coastal regions. Therefore a latent social discontent exists, especially in the countryside. The government’s current efforts(47) are aimed at improving incomes in the rural zones. There are two main objectives: firstly, to reduce the income gap between the rural and urban zones; and secondly, to rebalance growth and diversify its sources by stimulating rural consumption. In fact, the consumption potential of the 700 million strong rural population(48) would give considerable support to the rate of growth. In this context, a revaluation of the yuan could compromise the success of the policy to revive rural areas, by increasing competition from imported agricultural goods, to the detriment of Chinese farmers. Nevertheless, the final impact is difficult to estimate in the absence of data. Generally, although the Chinese authorities recognise that a more flexible exchange rate policy is an undeniable long-term objective, the weaknesses of a financial sector in the process of restructuring, the fragilities of the current economic cycle and the latent social tensions must increase the government’s tendency to prefer financial stability, at least in the short term.

### Chinese Revaluation Bad – Unrest

#### China’s prime motivation for not revaluing is concern over impacting the rich-poor gap

Michael Lelyveld, RFA Mandarin service director, 5-18-2005, “Analysis,” http://www.rfa.org/english/features/lelyveld/2005/05/18/china\_currency/

Naughton said that a major concern for the government in keeping the yuan's value low is that it has helped farmers, who have been able to increase prices for agricultural products. When the currency goes up, China's farmers will face more competition from imported food. "As you know, the rural income gap has been very large in recent years and has been increasing. But the administration of Wen Jiabao has really made a very strong effort to narrow this gap and support the incomes of farmers, and this is one area where they've had significant success in the last year," Naughton said.

#### Revaluation jacks up the cost of food imports, hurting rural farmers and sparking massive social unrest

Sebastian Mallaby, 3-7-2006, “The China Card,” NY Sun, p ln

There's a powerful reason for China's recalcitrance. The country's technocrats were convinced years ago that revaluation made economic sense. But revaluation would cut the price of food imports, depressing earnings of Chinese farmers. Faced with simmering discontent among rural Chinese who have been left behind by China's coastal boom, the dictatorship fears that currency revaluation could unleash furious protest.

#### Rural unrest sparks Russia-China border war – escalates to nuclear winter

Alexander Sharavin, 10-3-2001, Defense and Security

Chinese propaganda has constantly been showing us skyscrapers in free trade zones in southeastern China. It should not be forgotten, however, that some 250 to 300 million people live there, i.e. at most a quarter of China’s population. A billion Chinese people are still living in misery. For them, even the living standards of a backwater Russian town remain inaccessibly high. They have absolutely nothing to lose. There is every prerequisite for “the final throw to the north.” The strength of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (CPLA) has been growing quicker than the Chinese economy. A decade ago the CPLA was equipped with inferior copies of Russian arms from later 1950s to the early 1960s. However, through its own efforts Russia has nearly managed to liquidate its most significant technological advantage. Thanks to our zeal, from antique MiG-21 fighters of the earliest modifications and S-75 air defense missile systems the Chinese antiaircraft defense forces have adopted Su-27 fighters and S-300 air defense missile systems. China’s air defense forces have received Tor systems instead of anti-aircraft guns which could have been used during World War II. The shock air force of our “eastern brethren” will in the near future replace antique Tu-16 and Il-28 airplanes with Su-30 fighters, which are not yet available to the Russian Armed Forces! Russia may face the “wonderful” prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia’s entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable to China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such “trifles” like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia’s armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the “Chechen” and the “Balkan” variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

### Chinese Revaluation Bad – Oil Prices Impact

#### Revaluation spurs more oil consumption, raising prices – empirically proven

Bloomberg, 7-22-2005, “China’s Demand for oil,” p http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=10000101&sid=aDwU\_ZE8RvqE&refer=japan

China, the world's biggest user of copper, soybeans and steel, may increase consumption of raw materials after a revaluation of the yuan made dollar-priced commodities cheaper to import. ``Since commodities are traded in U.S. dollars, a yuan appreciation makes commodities more affordable for Chinese consumers,'' said Tobias Merath, a commodities strategist with Credit Suisse in Zurich. ``Therefore we expect Chinese demand for commodities and especially for oil to increase.'' China Petroleum & Chemical Corp., the biggest oil refiner in Asia, and Jiangxi Copper Co., China's biggest producer of the metal, are among companies that will benefit from lower import costs. China is the biggest oil consumer after the U.S. and the biggest nickel buyer after Japan. Cheaper raw materials may accelerate demand already up from last year with the expansion of China's economy, which grew 9.5 percent in the second quarter and helped fuel a four-year surge in commodity prices. The Reuters/Jefferies CRB Index of 19 commodities rose to 24-year high in March. Oil reached a record $62.10 a barrel on July 7, and copper touched a 16-year high last month. China will value the yuan against a basket of currencies, the central bank said on its Web site yesterday. The new yuan rate strengthens the currency by 2.1 percent to 8.11 per U.S. dollar immediately, the People's Bank of China said. Until now, the yuan had been pegged at about 8.3 per dollar. Stimulate Demand ``Anything that makes commodities cheaper for China will stimulate demand,'' said Nick Moore, a metals analyst at ABN Amro Holding NV in London. ``The revaluation is a lot smaller than expected. We were hoping for 6 percent.''

#### High prices destroy the Mexican economy – shocks and US dependence

BBC, 8-26-2004, p. np

The economy's growth in the second quarter, which exceeded the expectations of experts, is a sign of the strengthening of a "virtuous circle" for the country in the second half of the year, according to the Private Sector Centre for Economic Studies (CEESP). It warns, however, that given that the rebound in the Mexican economy is the result of the strengthening of the US economy, we must pay attention to the effect that high international oil prices could have on that nation. The constant rise in crude oil prices in recent weeks has already led to greater caution among consumers in the powerful neighbouring nation, who have reduced their spending as they await signs of recovery without higher prices because of the cost of energy. On this matter, the CEESP mentions the advisability of accelerating the internal strengthening of the Mexican economy in order to prevent negative effects from an external shock. And in this respect the conclusions of the National Finance Convention (CNH) were a good sign. Although the CNH does not include greater progress in the fiscal area, it implied that there is concern about some key aspects of the stability of the budget.

#### Mexican collapse goes global

Dallas Morning News, 11-28-9595, p np

This time, the world is keeping a close eye on Mexico's unfolding financial crisis for one simple reason: Mexico is a major international player. If its economy were to collapse, it would drag down a few other countries and thousands of foreign investors. If recovery is prolonged, the world economy will feel the slowdown. "It took a peso devaluation so that other countries could notice the key role that Mexico plays in today's global economy," said economist Victor Lpez Villafane of the Monterrey Institute of Technology. "I hate to say it, but if Mexico were to default on its debts, that would trigger an international financial collapse" not seen since the Great Depression, said Dr. Lpez, who has conducted comparative studies of the Mexican economy and the economies of some Asian and Latin American countries. "That's why it's in the best interests of the United States and the industrialized world to help Mexico weather its economic crisis," he said. The crisis began last December when the Mexican government devalued the currency. Last March, after weeks of debate, President Clinton, the International Monetary Fund and a handful of other countries and international agencies put together a $ 53 billion rescue package for Mexico. But despite the help - $ 20 billion in guarantee loans from the United States - Mexico's financial markets have been volatile for most of the year. The peso is now trading at about 7.70 to the dollar, after falling to an all-time low of 8.30 to the dollar Nov. 9. The road has been bumpy, and that has made many - particularly U.S. investors - nervous. No country understands better the importance of Mexico to the global economy than the United States, said Jorge Gonzlez Dvila, an economist at Trinity University in San Antonio. "Despite the rhetoric that you hear in Washington, I think that most people agree - even those who oppose any aid to Mexico - that when Mexico sneezes, everybody catches a cold," Mr. Gonzlez said.

### High Oil Prices Bad – Poverty Impact

#### High prices hurt energy access for the poor

Joe Barnes, research fellow at the Baker Institute for Public Police at Rice, Amy Jaffe, Fellow for Energy Studies at the Baker Institute, and. Edward L. Morse, Executive Adviser at Hess Energy Trading Company and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Energy Policy in 1979–81, Winter 2003/2004, originally printed in National Interest, http://www.saudi-us-relations.org/newsletter2004/saudi-relations-interest-01-06.html

Lower oil prices should remain a U.S. goal, not only to wean unstable regimes from the ill-effects of undiversified economies, but to give most of the world, including the 1.6 billion people on the planet lacking energy services altogether, a chance to achieve prosperity. This goal can only be achieved by de-politicizing oil. The United States should turn back to multinational agencies and push more seriously for new ways to bring the rules of global oil trade and investment in harmony with the rules governing other trade in manufactures and services. Liberalization and open access to investment in all international energy resources would mean their timely development rather than today's worrisome delays. Rather than try to accomplish this on an American bilateral basis, the U.S. should lead the industrialized West to make a joint effort, possibly considering discriminating actively against products from countries that do not permit investment in their energy resources, much the way most favored trade status and the WTO have been used to bring better practices in other industrial sectors. This is a tough policy, but ultimately, few of the top oil producing countries have used their oil wealth constructively to diversify their economies and improve the lot of their populations.

#### Lack of energy access exacerbates poverty

Paul Roberts, energy expert and writer for Harpers, 2004, The End of Oil, pg. 8

Around the world, more than one and a half billion people — roughly one-quarter of the world — lack access to electricity or fossil fuels and thus have virtually no chance to move from a brutally poor, preindustrial exis¬tence to the kind of modern, energy-intensive life many of us in the West take for granted. Energy poverty is in fact emerging as the new killer in de¬veloping nations, the root cause of a vast number of other problems, and perhaps the deepest divide between the haves and have-nots.

#### Poverty is on-par with an ongoing nuclear war – it kills millions a year

Mumia Abu-Jamal, 9-19-1998, “A Quiet and Deadly Violence,” www1.minn.net/~meis/quietdv.htm

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural" violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; "By `structural violence' I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting `structural' with `behavioral violence' by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on." -- (Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it -- really? Gilligan notes: "[E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world." [Gilligan, p. 196]

## Jackson-Vanik DA
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#### Jackson-Vanik will be repealed now – administration is pushing

Erik Wasson, 5-6-2012, “Nine tasks Congress can’t avoid,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1007-other/225631-nine-tasks-congress-cant-avoid

Russia is slated to enter the World Trade Organization (WTO) by July 23 and unless Congress acts, U.S. exports to Russia will face new discrimination after that date. At issue is the Jackson-Vanik amendment, enacted in the 1980s to punish the Soviet Union for preventing Jews from emigrating to Israel. The amendment technically conditions most-favored-nation trading status on congressional monitoring and approval. Under the terms of the WTO, however, MFN status must not be conditional. Unless the U.S. removes Russia from Jackson-Vanik, Russia will have the right to deny U.S. exports the lower barriers it gives other WTO members. The administration is pushing for a clean Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) bill. Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.) and Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) are leading a fight to tie it to a bill freezing the assets of the accused murderers of Russian whistleblower Sergei Magnitsky. Action on that bill could clear the way for PNTR passage next month.

#### Obama’s political capital is key to repeal of Jackson-Vanik

Corey Boles, staff writer, 2-29-2012, “White House Pushes for Russia Trade Agreement,” WSJ, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203753704577254192095999600.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

WASHINGTON—The Obama administration on Wednesday began a public push for Congress to permanently lower trade barriers with Russia, arguing the move would benefit U.S. exporters and aid a crack down on trading violations by Moscow. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told lawmakers on the House Ways & Means Committee that permanently granting Russia "most favored nation" status would enable the U.S. to challenge anti-competitive practices by the country, and ensure that U.S. exporters are on level footing with foreign competitors in tapping the Russian market. "We have been very plain," Mr. Kirk said at a congressional hearing on the administration's trade priorities. "This is something collaboratively we need to achieve." But the White House likely faces a tough slog in getting the Russia measure through the House and Senate later this year, with lawmaker expressing concern over Moscow's positions on Syria and Iran and its own internal political situation. "I think there'll be a lot of resistance in Congress to normalizing trading relations with Russia given their actions in Syria and Iran," said Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.), a leading voice on foreign policy for the Republican party. Democrats in the House and Senate agreed. "I don't think there's a real sentiment to pass a trade agreement [with Russia] this year," said Sen. Sherrod Brown (D., Ohio). Rep. Sander Levin (D., Mich.), the top Democrat on the ways & means panel, cited Russia's actions over the deteriorating situation in Syria and fears of vote fraud in Russia's March 4 presidential election as complicating factors for a Russia trade vote to pass in Congress. Russia blocked an attempt earlier this month by the U.N. Security Council to take actions against the brutal crackdown on protestors by the Syrian regime. Meanwhile, Vladimir Putin is expected to easily win election as president in the weekend poll, although the results will be closely watched for evidence of manipulation by his government. Russian officials have said the country won't honor WTO commitments with the U.S. if Congress doesn't repeal the trade restrictions. Officials at the Russian Embassy in Washington weren't immediately available for comment. Rep. Dan Burton (R., Ind.), chairman of the House subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, predicted the Russia measure will nonetheless pass Congress. "If you're saying we ought to be doing business with China, how can you say we shouldn't be doing business with a huge emerging market like Russia," Mr. Burton said. Russia is set to join the World Trade Organization by August, and will be required to lower its tariffs by as much as 50% for other countries in the trade organization. The U.S. must in turn repeal a decades-old trade measure preventing Russia from benefitting from lower tariffs on its U.S. exports, or American exporters won't benefit from Russia's new WTO membership. Several leadership aides this week said there hadn't been any discussions yet about how the Russia matter might be handled in Congress. Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D., Mont.), who just returned from Moscow, called it a "no-brainer" that Congress would permanently normalize relations with Russia. Rep. Dave Camp (R., Mich.), the chairman of the Ways & Means Committee said at Wednesday's hearing that he was looking to "the administration to build confidence and provide leadership on the economic and non-economic issues."

#### < Insert Specific Link Here – Plan Costs Political Capital >
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#### Russian PNTR is key to relations and prevents US-Russia war

Jeffrey Mankoff, Council for Foreign Relations, 9-7-2010, “Changing Course in Moscow,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66743/jeffrey-mankoff/changing-course-in-moscow?page=show

Russia’s new course has already produced some results, most importantly in relations with the United States. In part, the warmer tone between the two countries is the result of the Obama administration’s “reset” policy, but Moscow, too, has proven more receptive to Washington’s outreach than in the last several years. In recent months, Russia and the United States signed the so-called New START nuclear arms reduction treaty, cooperated on sanctions against Iran (always a sensitive subject in Moscow), and agreed to open new supply routes for the U.S.-led war in Afghanistan. In June, Medvedev traveled to Silicon Valley to drum up investment for a high-tech center the Kremlin is building outside of Moscow. His biggest success was convincing Cisco Systems to invest $1 billion in Russian technology ventures, providing a tangible vote of confidence on the part of the U.S. business community. Yet it remains too early to pronounce an end to the West’s difficulties with Russia. Although Medvedev is constitutionally responsible for steering Russian foreign policy, Putin remains powerful as prime minister, especially in light of speculation that he will return to the Kremlin in 2012. Below the offices of president and prime minister, Russia’s bureaucracy is unwieldy and resistant to change, and much of the military and security services remain overtly hostile to the West. And as the leaked Foreign Ministry document suggests, Russia has not given up its great power ambitions, even though it may desire better relations with the West. Finally, a fusion of state and corporate power in Russia has given oligarchs and managers of state corporations the ability to block initiatives that threaten their economic interests -- such as opening up the Russian economy to foreign competition. It is also impossible to separate the new direction in foreign policy from the economic downturn, which has cast doubt on Russia’s post-Soviet economic model of relying on a heavily centralized, state-dominated energy sector to the exclusion of innovation and entrepreneurship. When the Russian economy was booming, Moscow felt confident enough to ignore many of the policy preferences of the United States and the European Union. But as oil prices fell and Russia’s economy started contracting, this hubris became harder to maintain. If oil prices start climbing again and Russia’s fiscal situation improves, Moscow may well conclude that an energy-fueled status quo is preferable to the expensive and uncertain prospect of modernization. If so, the case for better relations with the West could be badly undermined -- which suggests that Western leaders have an interest in taking advantage of the current moment to emphasize they are serious about putting relations with Russia on a new foundation. How can the United States convince Moscow that it has more to gain from enhancing its cooperation with the West, regardless of oil prices? A major reason why U.S.-Russian relations have been so unpredictable is that the relationship is largely focused on hard security issues and not on economic ties. Last year, U.S.-Russian bilateral trade was only $25.3 billion (less than one-twentieth of U.S.-Chinese trade), and only four percent of foreign direct investment in Russia came from the United States. The Obama administration should do more to encourage trade with and investment in Russia, including launching a strategic economic dialogue with Moscow and making a concerted push in Congress to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Russia’s ascension to the WTO is particularly important, since membership would make a reversion to energy-driven mercantilism more difficult. The United States should put the ball firmly in Russia’s court, identifying as a priority Russia’s membership in the WTO by the end of the year and providing technical assistance to overcoming outstanding disputes (including addressing Georgian objections).
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#### US-Russian relations solve nuke war and every global problem

Graham Allison, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School and a former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, 10-30-2011, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/67178.html

House Speaker John Boehner recently delivered a fiery indictment of Russia and the Obama administration’s entire “reset” in Russian policy. From the vantage point of two longtime Russia watchers — one a Republican who served in the George W. Bush administration and the other a Democrat who served in the Pentagon under President Bill Clinton — Boehner misses the point. That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

### Yes JV Repeal – Momentum

#### JV will get repealed soon

Inside U.S. Trade, 3-16-2012, “Baucus eyes Russia MFN Vote After Duma Ratifies WTO Accession,” Lexis.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) yesterday (March 15) said he expects Congress to pass permanent most favored nation (MFN) legislation for Russia "within a couple of months" but after the Russian Duma completes its own ratification procedures in order to formally accede to the World Trade Organization. According to informed sources, Baucus is eyeing a markup of the necessary legislation to remove Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment within two months. He is hoping for a Senate floor vote before the August recess, though he does not appear to have a commitment from Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), they said. Russia's Duma has until July 22 to ratify all necessary legislation before it can accede. After ratification passes, 30 days must pass before Russia is considered a WTO member. If the Duma does not act until the July 22 deadline, it would put the Congress under a tight time schedule to pass a bill before both chambers recess on Aug. 3 for the summer. Some sources said they expect the Russia vote to slip to the lame-duck session, and other speculate it may not take place until next year. Speaking to reporters after a March 15 hearing on Russia MFN, Baucus predicted that "we'll get legislation passed this year and signed by the president."

#### Momentum ensures JV repeal

Jacey Fortin, staff writer, 3-13-2012, “The Jackson-Vanik Amendment: How Soviet-Era Trade Regulations Could Affect Human Rights in Russia,” Ibtimes, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/313539/20120313/jackson-vanik-russia-human-rights-obama.htm

As Russia prepares to join the World Trade Organization this summer, the U.S. Congress is under increasing pressure to repeal a Soviet-era trade restriction called the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Jackson-Vanik was enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1974, back when Leonid Brezhnev still ruled as the General Secretary of the Soviet Union's Communist Party. The measure enforced U.S. trade restrictions against the communist bloc as long as they refused to permit free emigration rights to Jewish citizens. Despite the fact that free emigration is now permitted in Russia, Jackson-Vanik is still on the books. But it's no longer a truly active piece of legislation; the trade restrictions have been waived repeatedly since 1993, according to the Moscow Times. On Monday, the leaders of Russia's political opposition movement, which has organized widespread protests against incoming Prime Minister Vladimir Putin, released a public letter calling for the United States to repeal Jackson-Vanik. The antiquated bill, they said, gives Putin ammunition for anti-American propaganda. It also "limits Russia's competitiveness in international markets for higher value-added products, leaving Russia trapped in its current petro-state model of development and preventing it from transforming into a modern, diversified and more hi-tech economy ... This helps Mr. Putin and his cronies, who continue to benefit from control over raw materials exports and who have no real interest in diversifying Russia's economy." The statement adds that keeping these restraints on Russia's economy will hurt the growing middle class, thereby stifling an increasingly independent voice that could bring political transformation and economic diversification to the country. Opening Up New Doors Meanwhile,Russia is scheduled to formally join the WTO by June, which will have its own implications for the country's economic future. Russia was invited in December of 2011, and official membership is pending the ratification of some final key documents by Russian officials. The former Soviet Union will then be obligated to abide by the trade rules of the WTO, which will reduce domestic subsidies, lower tariffs and generally limit the government's ability to regulate trade with other countries. The move signals a growing aversion to the principal of isolationism and an increasing willingness to open up the Russian economy to the international community. The U.S. administration approved of the decision and vowed to seize the opportunity to repeal Jackson-Vanik, which will be in violation of WTO regulations. "Russia's membership in the WTO will generate more export opportunities for American manufacturers and farmers, which in turn will support well-paying jobs in the U.S.," said a White House statement released in December. "President Obama told President Medvedev that the administration is committed to working with Congress to end the application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to Russia in order to ensure that American firms and American exporters will enjoy the same benefits of Russian WTO membership as their international competitors."

#### Repeal efforts are gaining steam

Michael Punke, Deputy United States Trade Representative, 3-19-2012, “Prepared Remarks of Deputy United States Trade Representative Michael Punke at the U.S. Chamber-BusinessEurope Joint Conference Location,” Federal News Service, Lexis.

That's why the President and Ambassador Kirk have stressed that we will work vigorously, and rapidly, with the congress to terminate application of Jackson-Vanik to Russia and enable extension of permanent normal trade relations. That effort is gaining steam, and I know that the U.S. businesses represented here today are actively engaged in this effort. A positive congressional vote on Jackson- Vanik for Russia is, above all, a matter of U.S. national economic interest, so that American businesses and workers can benefit fully from the strong WTO accession package negotiated laboriously over nearly two decades.

### Yes JV Repeal – Laundry List

#### Will pass—dems, gop, and business support

Desmond Butler, 3-27-2012, “US Trade Upgrade May Worsen Relations With Russia”, <http://www.whec.com/news/stories/S2555282.shtml?cat=10056>

Republicans and Democrats are trying to tie the easing of the so-called Jackson-Vanik restrictions to a measure imposing sanctions against Russian officials linked to human rights abuses. That would infuriate Russia and would be the latest hitch in what administration officials consider a major foreign policy success: improved relations with Russia after a sharp downturn during the Bush administration. They call it the "reset." Obama administration officials are trying to keep the rights and trade measures apart. They are concerned about retaliation and do not want to aggravate relations further. Tensions have been growing over issues like missile defense and the international response to uprisings in Libya and Syria. But the U.S. still hopes for a degree of cooperation with Russia on other matters, such as stopping Iran’s nuclear program. "We want to deal with trade issues in one sphere and democracy issues and human rights in another sphere," said Michael McFaul, the U.S. ambassador to Russia. The administration first wants to deal with trade. It has powerful allies in the U.S. business community supporting the repeal of Jackson-Vanik, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which calls the repeal its top trade priority this year. Russia soon will get more opportunities for international trade when it joins the World Trade Organization. If the U.S. doesn’t repeal Jackson-Vanik, American companies could be at a competitive disadvantage.

#### Yes repeal—domestic and international support

RIA Novosti, 3-28-2012, “Anti-Russian Amendment Now Headache for U.S.”, http://russian-untouchables.com/eng/2012/03/anti-russian-amendment-now-headache-for-u-s/

Obama has spoken against the amendment, a tool of the Cold War that denies Russia the status of permanent normal trade relations over the restriction on emigration of Soviet Jewry in the 1970s. “I have asked Congress to repeal Jackson-Vanik to make sure that all your companies and American companies all across the country can take advantage of it,” he said in March at a business roundtable in Washington, D.C. U.S. ambassador to Russia, Michael McFaul, has called repeal of the amendment a top priority for the White House this year. He has repeatedly spoken against Jackson-Vanik, including in an interview with Voice of America last week. The Obama administration could attempt swaying pro-Jackson-Vanik congressmen one by one or try to get the business lobby to convince the legislators of the damages U.S. businesses faces in Russia over the amendment, Garbuzov said. But neither strategy would yield fast results, he said. Emigration from Russia is unhindered now, and the White House has waived the amendment since 1989 on an annual basis, but the Congress never removed Russia from its coverage. Strictly American Business “Canceling Jackson-Vanik would be a largely symbolic move, but the amendment serves as an invisible red light to Russian-American economic relations,” said Arseny Dabbakh, an analyst with Rye, Man & Gor Securities. The United States are Russia’s only eight-biggest trade partner, with bilateral trade standing at $31 billion in 2011, according to Russian Federal Customs Service. China tops the list with $83 billion, followed by Germany with $71 billion and the Netherlands with $68 billion. Russia needs U.S. investment, which is practically absent now, while American companies are interested in Russia, given their attempts to expand their export operations following the recession that harmed the internal market, Dabbakh said by telephone. “International business views Russia as an unsaturated market for housing, durable and consumer goods, oil and gas services, and … even infrastructure,” said Ariel Cohen, a leading expert with the Washington, D.C.-based Heritage Foundation. “Investors still pay a high price for the Kremlin’s domestic heavy-handedness,” he said by email.

#### Public support ensures repeal

Dick Krickus, a distinguished professor emeritus at the University of Mary Washington and has held the H.L. Oppenheimer Chair for Warfighting Strategy at the U.S. Marine Corps University.

3-28-2012, <http://russian-untouchables.com/eng/2012/03/will-russia-graduate-from-the-jackson-vanik-amendment-by-krickus/>

To complicate matters, democratic activists like Alexi Navalny, the blogger who helped energize recent public protest demonstrations, and Lyudmila Alexeyeva, who heads Moscow’s Human Rights Group, favors Jackson-Vanik’s repeal. They made this known–along with a number of their colleagues–in a letter to the U.S. Congress. Since then, they have supplemented their request by supporting the Magnitsky Act as well.

### JV = Top Of Docket

#### JV repeal is a top priority for Obama

Jackson Diehl, 5-29-2012, “Obama’s misguided wooing of an uninterested Putin,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/obamas-misguided-wooing-of-an-uninterested-putin/2012/05/13/gIQATs9MNU\_story.html

Obama’s fixation on a nuclear deal has prompted a major turnaround in his treatment of Putin, whom he shunned for three years in the hope of promoting the supposedly more “reformist” Dmitry Medvedev. Though he might have waited several days to call, Obama nevertheless congratulated Putin on an election that international observers said was neither free nor fair. He has made repeal of the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, which limits U.S. trade with Russia, a priority in Congress this spring.

#### It’s being debated now

Charles Tannock, ECR Foreign Affairs Spokesman, 5-5-2012, “Putin’s Choice,” Malta Independent, http://www.independent.com.mt/news.asp?newsitemid=143898

The United States Congress is currently debating a law that would impose asset freezes and visa bans on the 60 people identified as having had some responsibility for Magnitsky’s detention and death. Many of the law’s supporters want it to replace the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment, a Cold War-era law that restricts US trade with Russia – and that the Obama administration is pushing to repeal. Such a change would be doubly beneficial: It would both enhance trade and hold to account people responsible for egregious human-rights abuses.

#### Jackson-Vanik is top of docket

Per Rashish, Vice President for Europe and Eurasia, United States Chamber of Commerce, 3-27-2012, “House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia Hearing; "Creating Jobs: Economic Opportunities in Europe and Eurasia."; Testimony by Peter Rashish, Vice President for Europe and Eurasia, U.S. Chamber of Commerce,” lexisnexis

While discussions about the scope and reach of a Transatlantic Economic and Trade Pact are at an early stage, Russia's imminent accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) is in its final lap. The Chamber congratulates the U.S. negotiating team led by the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for securing the commercially strong agreement under which Russia is finally joining the WTO. Approval of PNTR and repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment with respect to Russia is one of the Chamber's top trade priorities before the Congress this year (the other such priority is reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States).

### Obama Pushing JV Repeal

#### Obama is pushing hard for JV repeal

Helene Cooper, 5-10-2012, “As Putin Postpones Meeting Obama,” NY Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/11/world/europe/analysts-seek-political-import-as-putin-puts-off-meeting-obama.html

The Obama administration, like those before it, has tried to persuade Congress to repeal it, but dozens of lawmakers have linked its repeal to the new legislation, named after Sergei L. Magnitsky, a Russian lawyer who was arrested and died in prison after trying to expose tax fraud by government officials. The legislation would deny visas to officials accused of abuse, in Russia and elsewhere, and freeze their assets in the United States. The administration has opposed those provisions as an intrusion on the ability of executive and consular authorities to conduct foreign affairs. Russian officials say they were led to believe that the administration would fight hard against the Magnitsky bill, and complain that it has not done enough. The administration backs the idea behind the bill, but is pushing hard to remove the provisions that most upset the Russians. The administration supports repealing the Jackson-Vanik law, because it could hurt American companies. A vote on both proposals is expected this year.

#### Obama’s pushing

Doug Palmer, staff writer, 3-7-2012, “Obama push for Russia trade bill ignites debate,” Chicago Tribune, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/sns-rt-us-usa-russia-tradetre8261rl-20120307,0,406922.story

U.S. lawmakers on Wednesday disagreed over President Barack Obama's push for legislation this year to strengthen trade ties with Russia by repealing a largely symbolic Cold War provision that conflicts with today's global trade rules.

#### Lobbying hard

Kathy Lally, staff writer, 3-12-2012, “Putin critics oppose Jackson-Vanik trade sanction law,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/putin-critics-oppose-jackson-vanik-trade-sanction-law/2012/03/12/gIQA1iMd7R\_story.html

The Obama administration has been lobbying Congress hard to repeal the trade amendment, known as Jackson-Vanik and introduced in 1974 to pressure the Soviet Union to allow Jews to emigrate. Though its sanctions have been regularly waived for years, Russia considers it an affront. The amendment will put the United States in violation of World Trade Organization rules when Russia joins in a few months, resulting in unfavorable tariffs for American companies.

#### Top priority

Ken Martinez, staff writer, 3-14-2012, “McFaul Pushes for Trade Status,” The Moscow Times, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/mcfaul-pushes-for-trade-status/454625.html

McFaul, former National Security Council senior director for Russia and a key architect of the administration's reset policy, said repealing the amendment is the administration's top trade priority for 2012 and that he sees no reason for it not to happen.

### AT: Magnitsky Bill

#### Threats are just threats – wont follow through with Magnitsky

Elena Chernenko, staff writer, 12-16-2011, “The "Magnitsky list" is prepared for a reset,” RusData Dialine, Lexis.

Mr. Barrasso was seconded by Sen. Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH). "Despite the fact that we are cooperating with Russia in the sphere of our common interests, we need new tools to put pressure on the Russian leadership, where our opinions differ," she suggested. "One such tool could be the Magnitsky Act. I welcome the measures taken by the State Department (which blacklisted 11 people in the Magnitsky case - Kommersant), but hope that we could achieve more." The president of the Freedom House, David Kramer, who spoke at the hearings, expressed the opinion that "already at the development stages, the Magnitsky Act has provided more tangible results than US administrations' efforts over the last 20 years combined. No other initiative has resulted in such an active reaction from Moscow," explained Mr. Kramer. "People responsible for human rights violations have, for the first time, felt the reality of the fact that they and their families will no longer enjoy the privileges of traveling to civilized countries, being educated there, and holding assets in Western banks." However, experts doubt that the bill will become law. "US lawmakers won't go as far as to completely undermine relations with Moscow and burn all bridges," Aleksey Malashenko told Kommersant. "Though, they will continue to threaten us."

#### Magnitsky bill is compatible with reset – no harm to relations

Juliette Kayyem, 11-3-2011, “Taking on Russia: A global financier fights back after a lawyer’s suspicious death in prison”, The Boston Globe, http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2011/11/02/takingrussia/bt9apZGnveS3tadO5pZ1YJ/story.htm

The reset strategy, however, should be coupled with this different kind of containment strategy. The significance of the Magnitsky legislation is that it allows the United States to engage and condemn simultaneously. Too often, human-rights legislation requires a singular and primary focus on injustices, without taking into account competing interests. Here is a law that actually merges human-rights values with street-fighter sensibilities. The US government could punish atrocities by individuals where it hurts them the most - in their wallets, via access to Western markets - and still break bread with the Kremlin. It focuses on individuals without actually needing the US government to say anything about that nation’s culpability. The United States could still say all the right things about Russian relations, but with our fingers crossed behind our backs as we make clear our disdain for those who act with impunity. It’s a kind of disingenuousness, but the kind that Russia would understand.

#### The Magnitsky doesn’t hurt the reset of US-Russian Relations – they respect strength

Garry Kasparov, 2-28-2012, “Why Vladimir Putin Is Immune to the American Reset”, Heritage Foundation, http://www.heritage.org/research/lecture/2012/02/why-vladimir-putin-is-immune-to-the-american-reset

Pushing back hard and setting a firm, even confrontational line is the only message the Putin regime will respond to. They respect only strength. All this talk of engagement transforming Russia slowly has been disproven. Twenty years ago, it was expected that Russia would eventually embrace the manners of the West, but now it’s clear the opposite has happened. Countries dealing with Russia have conformed again and again to the corrupt practices institutionalized by Putin. As I said in my testimony on the Hill last June,[2] the system is not corrupt; corruption is the system. So if you are going to go after these guys, you have to use banks, not tanks. Hit them in their wallets, because that is what they care about. Senate Bill 1039, titled the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, would do exactly that. It is a bill that has the real teeth that Speaker Boehner referred to. Just one bureaucrat punished for his participation in crimes against human rights and the rule of law would have a huge ripple effect in Russia. Sadly, the State Department has attempted to preempt such tough action by issuing their own “secret” list for a travel ban on select Russian officials. This should be seen for what it is: watering down a serious effort with a superficial one. The entire point must be to publicize the list, to name names, to confront the criminals and their crimes, make it clear there are standards that will be defended. Resolution and openness are the best weapons against a mafia structure. Jackson–Vanik is an obsolete structure, of course, but do not trivially discard it without putting something in its place that makes clear America’s commitment to human rights and its willingness to defend them. Senate Bill 1039 is such a piece of legislation, and I would urge everyone to make it a reality. Twenty-five years ago, Ronald Reagan met with Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik, and the last Soviet leader had an ambitious reset proposal. I remember this meeting well. Reagan refused the offer categorically, refused to make concessions to a system he understood to be evil, refused to compromise on principles where they mattered most. How about this as a model for a reset with Putin’s Russia? Stand up for your principles. Make a reset that supports the Russian people, not our oppressors. Make that distinction clear. As in 1987, resolve is required. You must never be afraid to confront dictators, because strength is the only language they understand. To remove a dangerous virus, a reset or a reboot is not enough. The entire system must be replaced, and that is what we hope to do.

### AT: Non-Obama Push Thumpers

#### Things Obama doesn’t push don’t come up before Congress

Ezra Klein, staff writer, 10-19-2011, “Ron Wyden, Senator From a Planet Where Congress Actually Works: Ezra Klein,” Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-10-20/ron-wyden-senator-from-planet-where-congress-works-ezra-klein.html

The reality is the opposite. The president acts, and Congress reacts. There are few exceptions in recent history -- the McCain-Feingold campaign-finance reforms are one -- in which members of Congress autonomously began work on a high-profile issue, and the president was eventually forced to sign or veto the resulting law. The vastly more common path is for the president to ask Congress for legislation on health care or education or jobs or infrastructure and then for Congress to begin some sort of (usually unsuccessful) process. There’s a reason for this, of course. The Founders envisioned competition between the various branches of government, but the political system evolved to emphasize competition between the two major political parties across branches of government. As leader of one of those parties, the president is in close contact with his congressional allies, and they coordinate their efforts, just as the other party coordinates its efforts against the majority. But Wyden’s office is a small outpost where the natives imagine how Congress would behave in a parallel universe. In Wyden’s office, health-care reform began late in the Bush presidency and wasn’t associated with the leadership of either party. In Wyden’s office, tax reform isn’t a matter left to the presidential candidates, it’s a policy pursued as if, as senators and Congress members have said over and over, it’s something they actually want to achieve. To Wyden, this parallel universe is real. “Can you imagine telling voters that if you elect me, the first thing I’m going to do in Washington is wait for the president to make some decisions?” he said, laughing. But outside Wyden’s office, in the halls of the Capitol, that is the first thing new members of Congress do. Outside Wyden’s office, the bipartisan Healthy Americans Act remains a proposal, not a law. Outside Wyden’s office, tax reform is mired in seemingly intractable partisan conflict. Oregon’s wonkish senator might have comprehensive, bipartisan plans to fix America’s problems, but he doesn’t have a way to fix America’s politics.

#### Thumpers irrelevant if they aren’t bills that pass

Kevin Drum, Political Blogger, “Immigration Coming Off the Back Burner?” 2010. http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

#### No political controversy outside of the bills themselves

Richard Wolf, staff writer, 10-13-2011, “Obama won't negotiate with Republicans on jobs,” The Oval, <http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2011/10/obama-wont-negotiate-with-republicans-on-jobs/1?csp=34news>

"We are happy to work with Republicans where they are willing to put politics behind the issues that are important to the American people," Obama said. But, he said, "we're not going to wait around and play the usual political games in Washington, because the American people are desperate for some solutions right now. "We're not going to create a lot of theater that then results in them engaging in the usual political talking points but don't result in action. People want action."

### AT: Law of the Sea Thumper

#### LOST won’t come up before the election and Obama isn’t pushing

Mark Landler, 5-23-2012, “Law of the Sea Treaty,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/world/americas/law-of-the-sea-treaty-is-found-on-capitol-hill-again.html

Despite sending a marquee delegation to testify before Congress, the White House has not exactly championed the treaty, certainly not like the New Start arms reduction treaty with Russia, which was pushed ardently by President Obama. For his part, Mr. Kerry promised to keep the debate away from the “hurly-burly of presidential politics” by delaying a vote until after the election. Still, for Mr. Kerry, whose name is on the shortlist of candidates to succeed Mrs. Clinton as secretary of state in any second Obama term, ratifying the Law of the Sea would be “a huge feather in his cap,” said Steven Groves, a fellow at the Heritage Foundation, who has argued against the treaty.

#### Won’t come up before the election

Helicopter Association International, 5-10-2012, “International Trade Issues,” http://rotor.com/Publications/RotorNewssupregsup/tabid/177/newsid1237/75536/mid/1237/Default.aspx

Nearly 200 of the most powerful U.S. business associations and companies, including the Business Roundtable, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Ford, and Citigroup, have been lobbying Congress heavily to repeal the amendment. Obama and many lawmakers support repeal, but election-year politics make it unlikely that Congress will consider the amendment before November.

#### Vote will be postponed

Walter Pincus, 5-28-2012, “Treaty on the seas is in rough Senate waters,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/fine-print-treaty-on-the-seas-is-in-rough-senate-waters/2012/05/28/gJQAzCyFxU\_story.html

The treaty was amended in 1994 during the Clinton administration to meet the Reagan objections. Both the Clinton White House and George W. Bush’s administration in 2004 and ’07, along with a bipartisan group of senators, supported ratification. Nonetheless it failed to come to a vote. Why? As then-Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin wrote in a Sept. 17, 2007, letter to her state’s Republican senators, “Ratification has been thwarted by a small group of senators who are concerned about the perceived loss of U.S. sovereignty.” Today, another small group is at it again, forcing Kerry to postpone any Senate vote on ratification until after the November elections. A two-thirds majority is required.

### Politics Link – Transportation Spending Unpopular

#### Infrastructure spending is controversial

New Republic, 5-18-2012, “Lost Highway,” http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/103393/public-infrastructure-investment-congress-spending-projects

But, rather than embrace the Senate’s legislation, the House GOP responded by pushing its own, utterly unserious bill. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, a former Republican member of Congress, has called it “the worst transportation bill I’ve ever seen during thirty-five years of public service.” He wasn’t exaggerating: The House bill slashes funding for Amtrak at a time when rapidly expanding ridership is putting even greater strain on the system’s resources. It exempts many transit projects from the standard environmental-impact analysis, changing the requirements that apply to projects near parks and historical sites and imposing a restrictive deadline on the review process. It tries to raise revenue from controversial oil and gas ventures—including the Keystone XL pipeline.

#### Even if it’s generally popular, GOP refuses to compromise on transportation funding now

Keith Laing, staff writer, 3-28-2012, “LaHood: Boehner needs to 'show a little leadership' on highway bill,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/highways-bridges-and-roads/218787-lahood-boehner-needs-to-show-a-little-leadership-on-highway-bill

Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood on Wednesday blasted House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio), telling him to "step up and show a little leadership" in the debate over a new federal highway bill. Appearing on Current TV's "Full Court Press" show Wednesday, LaHood chided Boehner for attempting to pass a short-term extension of the current funding for transportation projects instead of holding a vote on the Senate's two-year version of the highway measure. "Speaker Boehner can't get his troops together," said LaHood, who previously served in the House as a Republican lawmaker with Boehner before being appointed Transportation secretary by President Obama. "What he needs to do is step up and show a little leadership," LaHood said of Boehner. "He could put moderate Republicans — he could get them to vote for this bill — get a hundred Democrats who have agreed to vote it and pass the Senate bill. That would be good for America." The current funding for transportation is set to run out on March 31. The Senate has passed a $109 billion bill that would provide transportation funding for the next two years, but the House has struggled this week to approve a short-term extension of the current funding. LaHood said Boehner "doesn't want to pass a bill with Democrats because that would be embarrassing to him. "And he can't pass it as long as he's got these 40-50 intransigent conservatives who do not want to do anything," LaHood said of Boehner's plan to rely on Republican votes to pass the transportation measure.

#### Transportation bills empirically spark fights

Jake Sherman, staff writer, 2-2-2012, “Infrastructure's long, long road,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0212/72397.html

But even if they get it out of the House, it looks to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Even Republicans in the upper chamber say Boehner and Mica’s approach is fatally flawed. Sen. Mary Landrieu (D-La.), who often sides with Republicans on drilling and energy issues, said the bill is “dead on arrival in the Democratic Senate. So it’s not really going anywhere. Hopefully, we can get a transportation bill but we won’t have those offsets in it.” Republicans are wary, too. Sen. Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.) has said Republicans should drop ANWR drilling — a revenue raiser that helps pay for the bill. And Sen. Lisa Murkowski, an Alaska Republican who is a major supporter of drilling in ANWR, is with Inhofe. “I’ve got to be pragmatic about it,” Murkowski said. “I look at it and I look at what I know of my colleagues here in the Senate … and I can see there’s some real hurdles there.”

### Politics Link – Highway Funding Unpopular

#### Highway funding sparks fights, even if it’s popular

Jake Sherman, staff writer, 2-8-2012, “In this Congress, even the easy bills get stuck,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0212/72645.html

The highway bill is another mess — despite a widespread desire to actually pass a sweeping energy and transportation bill. The opposition to the bill is only getting worse and more solid as parochial interests relay concerns with the legislation. Several GOP lawmakers involved in the vote-counting process simply don’t see a way for Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) to get the bill as it’s currently written across the finish line, despite the rosy picture leadership is painting. To make things worse, this is the party’s major jobs package of the first quarter of an election year. There are even some Republicans pining for their leadership to take up the bill from the Senate Energy and Public Works Committee produced by Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) and Jim Inhofe (R-Okla.).

#### Highway funding empirically can’t pass because of controversy

Jake Sherman, staff writer, 3-7-2012, “Boehner’s highway bill plea to GOP doesn’t deliver,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/73761.html

House Speaker John Boehner’s plea Wednesday to save his massive highway bill wasn’t the silver bullet some hoped it would be. The Ohio Republican’s speech urging colleagues to vote for Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman John Mica’s bill has “gained some traction,” according to a Republican source, but the GOP lawmakers are still opposing the measure in alarmingly high numbers, according to top GOP insiders. It leaves Boehner and the Republican leadership scratching their heads about what went wrong and will likely force the House GOP to take up a shorter-term measure — most likely a short-term extension. The House doesn’t want to take up the Senate bill, and they’re mulling how long of a clean extension they’ll propose. GOP leadership will meet Thursday ahead of a one-week recess to make a decision. But an 18-month or two-year extension would also have a rocky road to passage. Although the rapid-fire educating of lawmakers about the last-minute tweaks to the highway bill has made some progress, top GOP aides don’t think it’s enough. Republicans are likely to wait for the Senate to act and will make an announcement when the House is out of session next week. It’s just another chapter in the saga that’s the House Republican majority. Internal drama over priorities — whether it’s keeping the government open or hiking the debt ceiling — has marked the GOP’s time in power. A great number of its members say that passing a meaty, five-year highway bill is key to their reelection hopes after a year of cutting spending and obscure regulations. “For me, this is the biggest,” said Pennsylvania Rep. Lou Barletta, a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee from the Scranton area, who wants a long-term bill. “I’ll obviously tell [voters] that we tried to pass a balanced-budget amendment, tried to be fiscally responsible. But the American people want jobs. And they understand this is the one bill that will put Americans back to work.” At the same time, a large number of Republicans remain spooked by the $260 billion price tag. Outside conservative groups have pressed Republicans hard to vote against the bill. And inside the building, conservatives have said the bill violates their principles. In the closed party meeting Wednesday, California Rep. Tom McClintock stood up and stridently opposed passage. The disagreements run far deeper than that. Boehner, Majority Leader Eric Cantor of Virginia and Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy of California have held up this highway bill as a model for how Republicans should govern. It would change mass transit funding, remove earmarks and allow wider drilling for oil to pay for the rebuilding of the nation’s crumbling infrastructure. But for those same reasons, the bill continues to have loud detractors. At least three GOP lawmakers — Reps. Kay Granger and Louie Gohmert of Texas as well as Mike Rogers of Alabama — stood up and voiced support for earmarks. Expanded drilling programs and transit changes locked up dozens of “no” votes for the party — those provisions were eventually tweaked. “I’ve been here for a long time,” said Tennessee Rep. John Duncan, who heads the Highway and Transit Subcommittee, “and I’ve seen several highway bills, and obviously, this is the one that’s by far the most difficult to pass, primarily because there aren’t earmarks.”

### Politics Links – Highway Funding Unpopular

#### Controversy over highway funding is intractable–

Kathryn Wolfe, staff writer, 3-14-2012, “Highway bill now over to John Boehner,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/74038.html

House Speaker John Boehner stands at a difficult crossroad. He has to do something about the transportation bill before the end of March, and the current menu of options laid out before him stink. Boehner has about five directions he could take, each with its own set of problems. He could stick with the original plan — a nearly five-year, $260 billion bill, which factions of his own party and pretty much the entire Democratic caucus dislike and have rejected. He could take up a truncated, 18-month version of the longer bill, which the GOP also has already rejected. He could take up the two-year, $109 billion bill the Senate passed Wednesday by a 74-22 vote, and modify it, but that would give Democrats a quiver full of arrows, both rhetorically and in an eventual conference committee. He could brew up some other mystery option, behind which support would have to be built in a short time frame. Or the problems before him might be so intractable that the only answer is to punt, possibly into next year. In that case, lawmakers would have to extend surface transportation programs that otherwise are to expire at the end of the month — and there’s no guarantee people would agree to that, either. That option would satisfy none of the various interests — including states, public agencies, planners, the business lobby — invested in the bill, but in some ways, it’s been the expected outcome since earlier this year, in part because of the difficulties of enacting major legislation during an election year. Privately, some Republicans are looking to punt past the elections, believing that they’ll end up with more of their wish list if the Senate — or the White House — changes hands next year.

### Politics Link – High Speed Rail Unpopular

#### HSR is empirically unpopular with republicans

New York Times, 12-28-2011, “High-Speed Rail,” http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/high\_speed\_rail\_projects/index.html

While high-speed trains have been zooming commuters across the continents of Europe and Asia for decades, the United States has yet to embrace the idea of the bullet train. President Obama, in his 2011 State of the Union speech, called for a high-speed rail system over the next 25 years. However, Mr. Obama’s proposal to spend $53 billion on high-speed rail over the next six years, part of his budget deal in April, hit a roadblock when Congressional Republicans eliminated money for that plan for the year.

#### GOP opposes HSR funding

New York Times, 12-28-2011, “High-Speed Rail,” http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/high\_speed\_rail\_projects/index.html

The year before, newly elected Republican governors in Florida, Ohio and Wisconsin turned down federal money their Democratic predecessors had won for new rail routes, lest their states have to cover most of the costs for trains that would draw few riders. The cuts will not halt the rail program since unspent money remains that can be used on new projects. But they leave the future of high-speed rail in the United States unclear. So far roughly $10 billion has been approved for high-speed rail, but it has been spread to dozens of projects around the country. If Congress does not approve more money, the net result of all that spending may possibly be better regular train service in many areas, and a small down payment on one bullet train, in California. California plans to build a 520-mile high-speed rail line from Los Angeles to San Francisco. And they are doing it in the face of what might seem like insurmountable political and fiscal obstacles. A state report in November 2011 projected the cost of the bullet train tripling to $98 billion for a project that would not be finished until 2033. Republicans in Congress are close to eliminating federal high-speed rail financing this year. And there are questions about how much the state or private businesses will be able to contribute.

#### Federal HSR funding is controversial

Jack Rodolico, 4-6-2012, “Why the U.S. doesn’t have high-speed rail – yet,” Latitude News, <http://www.latitudenews.com/story/why-the-u-s-doesnt-have-high-speed-rail-yet/>

Californians have a problem — a problem China tackled without a second thought, and Europe handled far more aggressively than the United States. Just about everyone agrees that bustling economies thrive with modern, efficient transportation like high-speed rail. The problem in the Golden State: who is going to pay for it? In the U.S., there is only one train that can travel at speeds above 150 miles-per-hour: Amtrak’s Acela Express, which runs daily between Boston and Washington, D.C. “We like to call it the hassle-free way to travel,” says Cliff Cole, a spokesman for Amtrak. Cole says the Acela is Amtrak’s most traveled and profitable route, with nearly 3.4 million riders in fiscal year 2011. Latitude News went to Boston’s South Station to ask Acela commuters to share their thoughts on fast rail expansion in the U.S. 00:0000:00 But Cliff Cole points to a fact about high-speed rail’s future in the U.S that makes it controversial. “There is no country in the world,” he says, “that operates a rail system without federal subsidies.”

### Politics Link – Space Transportation Unpopular

#### Bipartisan opposition to space – your evidence is out-dated.

Frank Morring Jr., Senior Editor, Space at Aviation Week, 2/26/2010, “NASA Plan Falls Flat In Congress,” Aviation Week and Space Technology, http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story\_channel.jsp?channel=space&id=news/asd/2010/02/26/01.xml&headline=NASA%20Plan%20Falls%20Flat%20In%20Congress

NASA’s proposed policy turnaround faces stiff bipartisan opposition in Congress, which twice authorized the George W. Bush administration’s Constellation program with bipartisan support. In back-to-back Senate and House hearings by the NASA authorizing committees this week, members from both parties sharply questioned Administrator Charles Bolden about the new plan he was defending. No lawmaker in either hearing endorsed the change. Objections to it fall into two broad categories — the lack of a clear objective in space for the new program, and the “faith-based” belief, in the words of one House member, that a commercial route to orbit for U.S. astronauts is better than the government-managed Ares I and Orion vehicles.

#### Broad Congressional opposition to financing space.

James Bacchus, former Member of Congress, from Florida’s 15th Congressional District, 3/16/2011, “American competitiveness needs space program,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/150091-american-competitiveness-needs-space-program

Yet, for all the considerable promise of private commercial space exploration, it is not at all clear that commercial rockets will be able to be “man-rated” by NASA to taxi astronauts any time soon. And, sadly, one of the very few recent examples of bipartisanship in Washington has been the utter bipartisan failure thus far to figure out what to do next in human space flight, how to make it work, and how to pay for it at a price our chosen leaders think we can afford.

#### No Congressional support for space – budget worries.

David M. Livingston, business consultant, financial advisor, and strategic planner, 8/10/2000, “From Earth to Mars: A Cooperative Plan,” http://www.spacefuture.com/archive/from\_earth\_to\_mars\_a\_cooperative\_plan.shtml

In today's world, public budgets and allocations are stretched in various ways, and different types of projects compete for funding. Most publicly funded projects have strong advocates behind them, both among the citizenry and in Congress, and many of these projects are deemed essential for many segments of the population. Just where funding allocations for a manned mission to Mars would fit into the budget is unknown, but to many people it is far more important to take care of our needs here on Earth than to worry about putting people on Mars. So far, funding has not been an issue because no credible plan for a manned mission to Mars has been put forward. Should such a plan come to fruition, however, it is going to face opposition from the politicians and the people unless reasons for undertaking the Mars mission are clearly explained and made available to everyone. The reasons and explanations must be compelling.

### Political Capital Key To Jackson-Vanik

#### Capital is key, it’s an uphill battle

Jacqueline McLaren Miller, Senior Associate in EWI, 3-14-2012, “The Next Round on Jackson-Vanik,” East West Institute, http://www.ewi.info/next-round-jackson-vanik

The Obama administration’s top trade priority this year is getting Russia graduated from Jackson-Vanik, and timing is crucial. When Russia formally joins the World Trade Organization (WTO) later this year, the United States will be in violation of WTO rules because Jackson-Vanik attaches conditions to the U.S.-Russia trade relationship. This means that American businesses will be at a disadvantage in Russia because the carefully negotiated reduced tariffs will not be extended to U.S. goods and services. The administration faces an uphill battle in Congress—both Democrats and Republicans have objections to granting Russia permanent normal trade relations (PNTR). Those objections are both economic (intellectual property concerns, market access) and political (commitment to rule of law, respect for human rights). Human rights proponents fear that graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik would deprive the U.S. of leverage over the Russian government. But Russia has been determined to be in full compliance with Jackson-Vanik every year since 1994, so it currently provides no sanctions on Russia. It could only do so should the Russian government abandon the free-market and start restricting emigration.

#### Obamas pushing – PC is key to JV repeal

Tom Barkley, staff writer, 2-17-2012, “Tensions With Russia Loom Over Trade Debate,” WSJ, http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2012/02/17/tensions-with-russia-loom-over-trade-debate/

The goal is to restore “permanent normal trade relations” before the accession – already approved by WTO members – goes into effect so that U.S. companies aren’t at a competitive disadvantage. That will require revoking restrictions in place since 1974 under a measure called Jackson-Vanik, which effectively denied the Soviet Union permanent normal trade status due to past emigration restrictions. “We’re certainly viewing August, potentially even earlier, as the deadline for Russia to get in, and that’s the deadline by which U.S. companies will start to lose out to our competitors,” a Baucus aide said in an interview. “So we would very much like to get it done by the end of the summer.” U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk has also set his sights on lifting the restrictions by summer’s end, expressing confidence that lawmakers won’t want to hurt U.S. exporters in order to send a message to Moscow. The administration has picked up its effort to build support for the measure, most notably with Russian trade getting a mention in President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address last month. “We’re gearing up for an engagement with the Hill,” Philip Gordon, assistant secretary of State for European and Eurasian affairs, told the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia on Friday. But Gordon said that while it is clearly in the U.S. interest to lift the restrictions, “you just can’t be sure” that logic will prevail in Congress. Raising the possibility that lawmakers will make some demands on human rights in return for repealing Jackson-Vanik, he said the administration is taking appropriate action on that front. But he added, “We’ll see what they demand.” Sen. Ben Cardin (D., Md.) and other lawmakers have pushed recently to incorporate measures from a recent bill he introduced, to impose a travel ban and possible asset freeze against serious human-rights violators, as part of any legislation to lift the Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions, according to another aide. The business community has also “come out in full force,” going on the Hill to make it clear Russia is a priority, said the Baucus aide. A business coalition–whose members include major groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and National Association of Manufacturers as well as multinationals such as Boeing Co. and General Electric Co., announced earlier this month that restoring trade relations with Russia will be the top trade priority this year. But key lawmakers such as Rep. Kevin Brady (R., Texas), who chairs the House Ways and Means trade subcommittee, have warned that the vote will be a heavy lift.

#### JV is a tough sell – capital is key

Peter Van Dyk, staff writer, 3-16-2012, “U.S. May Repeal Jackson-Vanik Amendment,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/2012/03/16/148732685/russia-to-join-world-trade-organization

DYK: The U.S. push for Russia to join the WTO was part of President Obama's reset with Moscow. Art Franczek, president of the American Institute of Business and Economics here, knows repealing Jackson-Vanik could be a tough sell.

### AT: Winners Win

#### Winners win not true for Obama

Robert Kuttner, Senior Fellow at Demos, Co-Founder of the American Prospect, and Co-Editor of the American Prospect, 5-10-2011, “Barack Obama’s Theory of Power” http://prospect.org/article/barack-obamas-theory-power

Obama won more legislative trophies during his first two years than Clinton did, but in many respects, they were poisoned chalices. Health reform proved broadly unpopular because of political missteps -- a net negative for Democrats in the 2010 midterm. The stimulus, though valuable, was too small to be a major political plus. Obama hailed it as a great victory rather than pledging to come back for more until recovery was assured. He prematurely abandoned the fight for jobs as his administration's central theme, though the recession still wracked the nation. And because of the administration's alliance with Wall Street, Obama suffered both the appearance and reality of being too close to the bankers, despite a partial success on financial reform. Obama's mortgage-rescue program was the worst of both worlds -- it failed to deliver enough relief to make an economic difference yet still signaled politically disabling sympathy for both "deadbeat" homeowners and for bankers. (See this month's special report on page A1.)

#### Spending PC makes Obama reluctant to push on other issues

Jason Grumet, staff writer, 9-22-2011, “"Pass this bill" - rebalancing the Administration's relationship with Congress,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/politics/183315-qpass-this-billq-rebalancing-the-administrations-relationship-with-congress

To date, the Obama Administration has largely presented Congress with legislative principles and worked behind the scenes as legislation is developed. There are surely many reasons for the Obama Administration’s approach to Congress. At the outset of his Administration, Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress. On health care, the memories of President Clinton’s assertive approach surely played a role. Moreover, the political capital expended to pass the Affordable Care Act clearly created some reluctance to push Congressional Democrats too hard on other issues. But it is hard to argue that the Administration received, much if any, political protection through its greater deference to Congress.

#### Fights bleed momentum

John Harris and Carol Lee, Staff writers for Politico, 1-20-2010, Obama’s first year, Politico, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9

Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.

### AT: Relations Resilient

#### No foundation means no resilience – small crises can spiral out of control

Igor S. Ivanov, President of the Russian Council on International Affairs, served as Russia’s foreign minister, 1-4-2012, “Political will is not enough,” Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/12/30/political\_will\_is\_not\_enough\_14142.html

Both points of view need to be taken into account. Without going into the intricacies of this polemic, it is safe to say that the negativity in Russian-American relations is still running high. As a result, even the mini crises that have occurred recently in bilateral relations could well have developed into a serious confrontation. The situation today is even more complicated than during the Cold War. At least during that time, Moscow and Washington had a mechanism for bilateral negotiations and the relationship was based on principles understood by both sides. That foundation has now been destroyed, while, unfortunately, no new one has emerged. The attempts to create a new foundation for relations in the form of multi-functional intergovernmental structures such as the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission and the Medvedev-Obama presidential commission have hardly been a success. They have failed to create a multi-tiered foundation for relations. Russia accounts for less than 1 percent of the United States’ foreign trade, while the U.S. share of Russian foreign trade is less than 4 percent. With no economic foundation, bilateral relations still depend on fluctuations in the political situation. Even the New START treaty, the unquestioned achievement of the reset, is in jeopardy.

#### Maintaining forward momentum is key

Graam Allison, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, October, 2011, “Russia and U.S. National Interests,” https://docs.google.com/a/whitman.edu/viewer?a=v&q=cache:v1As8GeyxbsJ:www.cftni.org/Russia-and-US-NI\_final-web.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjmHeNTG3fphu7JCW-dkYSxdPpJQE213NF0RAJug9sqKqxnQo2yjbhrZ3smFx9YECiKIuU1hnheuV9wxI1ZrWppy\_ur6jJZytf0uBTP5g5edCU5uHlwvzW7n0aQN-\_iLYV7-7\_h&sig=AHIEtbSK62thEDk-oXR-yHG5cAQ8DsZdXw&pli=1

As a practical matter, even a stalled relationship could be problematic. The United States and Russia are both motivated to improve relations largely on the basis of hopes for what a stronger relationship could produce. If the prospects for realizing those hopes become too remote, it is uncertain whether what has been accomplished so far is sufficient to prevent our substantial remaining differences from tearing the U.S.-Russian relationship apart.

### AT: Relations Resilient

#### JV adds creates a critical mass of problems that destroys all relations

Pavel Koshkin, staff writer, 1-19-2012, “Lavrov picks a fight over trade,” Russia Beyond the Headlines,” http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/01/19/lavrov\_picks\_a\_fight\_over\_trade\_relations\_14217.html

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov has warned the U.S. to stop applying economic sanctions prescribed by the Jackson-Vanik amendment or face difficulties in its economic relations with Russia. Lavrov said that if the sanctions do not stop, Russia will not comply with its World Trade Organization (WTO) commitments toward the U.S. and seriously complicate the economic activity of American businessmen in Russia. The Jackson-Vanik amendment, adopted by the U.S. Congress in 1974, restricted trade with the Soviet Union and other communist countries that prevented the free emigration of Jews. According to Lavrov, the amendment contradicts the basic principles of the WTO because it discriminates against Russia. Russia is expected to shortly ratify all documents related to its WTO membership, which was finally offered on Dec. 16 after 18 years of negotiations. Although Lavrov’s move would seem to affect U.S.-Russia relations, experts from both Russia and the U.S. are reluctant to say that there will be any long-term consequences. “I do not think that by itself Lavrov’s position, if it is implemented, could undo the reset, but it certainly could add another burden to the reset,” said Gordon Hahn, an American specialist on Russia at the Monterey Institute for International Studies in California. “So it could help reach a critical mass of irritating problems that could undo the reset, especially if a crisis occurs in some sphere.” Yevgeny Minchenko, the head of Russia’s International Institute for Political Expertise, connects Lavrov’s statement to the ambivalence of some in Russia’s economic community towards the WTO. “Russia has many influential lobby economic groups that are against the country’s accession to the World Trade Organization,” Minchenko said. “And any arguments against Russia’s WTO membership will be only welcomed in some economic cycles.” But even if Lavrov’s comments are directed at a domestic audience, they could still affect its foreign relations. “The Russian foreign minister’s words prove that Moscow wants the bilateral relations to be complicated,” said Gregory Feifer, senior correspondent for Radio Liberty and a specialist in U.S.-Russian relations. “Lavrov’s statement is not new; such a hardline position is quite typical for Russia. Remember [Prime Minister Vladimir] Putin’s previous stance regarding U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s statement about the December protests in Moscow. And the White House understands this. Besides, Putin himself wants to be seen as tough leader toward the U.S. It’s his priority before the upcoming presidential campaign.” Regarding the Jackson-Vanik amendment, Russian and American experts point out the urgent need to scrap the amendment as an outdated Cold War relic. “I already stated many times that continuing application of Jackson-Vanik Amendment to Russia is both, immoral and, moreover, illegal as Russia fulfilled all its obligations under original Jackson-Vanik amendment requirements over 20 years ago,” said Edward Lozansky, the president and founder of the American University in Moscow. “Congressional rejection of Russia's graduation from the amendment is a sad proof that politics takes precedent and triumphs over sound policy.” Lozansky is doubtful about Lavrov's ultimatums. “Taking into account that the U.S. business community is interested in resolving this case as soon as possible, a wise PR campaign in Washington may lead to better results,” he said. Hahn also describes the amendment as “truly a Cold War relic” that needs to be removed. “I think the Russians, have overreacted here, but the overreaction in this case is understandable,” he said. “I can perhaps understand the threat to refrain from compliance with WTO stipulations in trade relations with the U.S. as a retaliatory move. The threat to interfere with American business in Russia seems to go outside a legal framework in accordance with WTO obligations and go beyond a tit-for-tat response.”

### JV Bad – Relations

#### Escalating crises are inevitable – JV is the only thing that can diffuse tensions

Lauren Goodrich, a research analyst at STRATFOR, 12-13-2011, “Russian Plans to Disrupt US and European Relations Over Missile Defense,” STRATFOR, http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=53358&pageid=89&pagename=Features

Tensions between the United States and Russia have risen in the past month over several long-standing problems, including ballistic missile defense (BMD) and supply lines into Afghanistan. Moscow and Washington also appear to be nearing another crisis involving Russian accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The crises come as Washington struggles over its many commitments in the world and over whether to focus on present events in Afghanistan or future events in Central Europe. Russia has exploited the U.S. dilemma, using its leverage in both arenas. However, if Moscow takes its aggressive moves too far, it could spark a backlash from the United States and Central Europe. The Persisting Disagreement over BMD The U.S. BMD scheme for Europe has long been a source of U.S.-Russian tensions. Washington argues that its European BMD program aims to counter threats emerging from the Middle East, namely Iran, but its missile defense installations in Romania and Poland are not slated to become operational until 2015 and 2018, respectively, by which time Russia believes the United States will have resolved its issues with Iran. Moscow thus sees U.S. missile defense strategy as more about the United States seeking to contain Russia than about Iran. Moscow does not fear that the United States is seeking to neutralize or erode Russia’s nuclear deterrent, however; the issue is the establishment of a physical U.S. military footprint in those two states — which in turn means a U.S. commitment there. Romania and Poland border the former Soviet Union, a region where Russia is regaining influence. Russia previously pressured key states in the Bush-era BMD scheme, such as Poland and the Czech Republic, to reconsider acceding to such plans. This assertiveness peaked with its 2008 invasion of Georgia, which both proved that Moscow was willing to take military action and exposed the limits of U.S. security guarantees in the region. The Russian move in Georgia gave the Central Europeans much to think about, prompting some attempts to appease the Kremlin. Still, these states did not abandon all faith in the United States as a strategic counter to Russia. Russia has since shifted its BMD strategy. Instead of categorically opposing the plan, Moscow proposed a cooperative, integrated scheme. The Kremlin reasoned that if Iran and other non-Russian threats were the real reason for expanding missile defense, then Russian involvement — which would strengthen the West’s defenses — would be welcomed. Russia’s BMD capabilities span the Eurasian continent, though their practical utility to and compatibility with U.S. systems is questionable. This plan was seen as a way to take a more conciliatory approach with the same end goal: blocking the placement of U.S. troops in Eastern Europe. The United States and most of NATO refused Russia’s proposals, however, leaving the door open for the Kremlin to introduce a new defense strategy, which Russian President Dmitri Medvedev outlined Nov. 23. Medvedev emphasized that Russia had exercised the “political will” to open a fundamentally new chapter in relations with the United States and NATO, only to have the United States spurn the offer. U.S. resistance to Russian inclusion in the BMD system forced Moscow to make other arrangements to counter U.S. plans in Central Europe — precisely the outcome it had hoped for. Medvedev also said that if United States continues to refuse BMD cooperation with Russia, Moscow would carry out plans for the deployment of the Iskander mobile short-range ballistic missiles and the activation of an early-warning radar system in Kaliningrad, a Russian exclave on the Baltic Sea that borders NATO members Poland and Lithuania. He said Russia also would consider the deployment of other Iskander systems, particularly along his country’s western and southern borders, and would hasten to fit its ballistic missiles with advanced maneuverable re-entry vehicles and penetration aids, a process that has long been under way. The prospect of Russian strategic weapons targeting BMD facilities was also raised. Medvedev added that more measures could be implemented to “neutralize the European component of the U.S. missile defense system,” concluding that all these steps could be avoided in favor of a new era of partnership between the United States and Russia if Washington so desired. The U.S. Dilemma The United States was expected to respond to Russia’s renewed strategy during the Dec. 8 meeting between NATO and Russian foreign ministers in Brussels. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton avoided doing so, however, reiterating that the BMD scheme was about Iran, not Russia. Clinton’s move highlights the dangerous U.S. position with regard to Russia. Washington has no intention of abandoning its commitment to Central Europe in the face of a resurging Russia, but commitments elsewhere in the world may prevent the United States from resisting Russia in the short term. At present, Washington is struggling to halt the deterioration of relations with Pakistan, which have reached a new low after a U.S. helicopter strike on the Afghan-Pakistani border killed some two dozen Pakistani servicemen. After the strike, the Pakistanis forbade the shipment of fuel and supplies for the NATO-led war effort in Afghanistan across the Pakistani border, leaving the United States and its allies wholly dependent on the Northern Distribution Network, at least temporarily. Moscow used this as an opportunity to remind Washington that it could cut this alternative route, leaving NATO and the United States in a catastrophic position in Afghanistan — a move tied directly to Russia’s negotiations over missile defense. While Russia has used previous threats against U.S. interests, such as increased support for Iran, as leverage in its BMD negotiations, its present threat marks a new dynamic. Washington called Moscow’s bluff on its threatened support for Iran, knowing Russia also did not want a strong Iran. But it cannot so easily dismiss the specter of interrupted supplies into Afghanistan, as this puts more than 130,000 U.S. and allied troops in a vulnerable position. Consequently, the United States must work to mitigate the BMD situation. American Olive Branch or New Crisis? In recent months, the United States has cultivated one potential olive branch to defuse short-term tensions. Previously, there was little the United States could offer Russia short of abandoning U.S. strategy in Central Europe. When tensions escalated in 2009 and 2010, the United States offered to facilitate large economic deals with Russia that included modernization and investment in strategic sectors, mainly information technology, space and energy. Since Russia had just launched its sister programs of modernization and privatization, it jumped on the proposal, reducing tensions and eventually joining U.S. initiatives such as sanctions against Iran. Now, the United States is extending another carrot: WTO membership. Russia has sought WTO membership for 18 years. Even though it has the 10th largest economy in the world, it has failed to win accession to the 153-member body. Though the country’s extreme economic policies have given members plenty of reason to exclude Russia, the main barriers of late have been political. For its part, Moscow cares little about the actual economic benefits of WTO membership. The benefits it seeks are political, as being excluded from the WTO made it look like an economically backward country (though its exclusion has given it a convenient excuse to rail against the United States and Georgia). As Russia sorted through its economic disputes with most WTO members, Georgia alone continued to block its bid because of the Russian occupation of the disputed Georgian territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. In recent months, Georgia has dropped its opposition under U.S. pressure — pressure that originated from Washington’s need for something to offer the Russians. With all obstacles cleared, the WTO should approve Russia’s candidacy Dec. 15-16, apparently giving the United States the olive branch it sought. Unfortunately for the United States, however, once Russia is voted in, each member-state must “recognize” Russia as a member. No WTO members, not even Georgia, have indicated that they intend to deny Russia recognition. But there is one country that cannot legally recognize Russian membership: the United States. The United States still has a Soviet-era provision in federal law called the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, which bars trade relations with certain countries guilty of human rights violations (namely, the Soviet Union). The measure continued to apply to Russia after the Soviet collapse, though every U.S. president has waived its provisions by decree since 1992. Only Congress can overturn it, however, and until it does so, the United States cannot recognize Russia as a WTO member. The White House has called for the provision’s immediate repeal, but with Congress and the White House divided over so many issues, it seems unlikely the issue will be resolved swiftly — if at all — under the current Congress and presidency. This gives Russia another opportunity to increase U.S.-Russian tensions. Indeed, Moscow could noisily decry the insult of the United States making Russian WTO accession possible only to derail it.

### JV Bad – Relations

#### It’s the major block to relations

Anna Malik, staff writer for BNO News, 3-9-2011, “Russian President Medvedev urges the U.S. to abandon the Jackson-Vanik amendment,” Breaking News Online, http://news.rickey.org/russian-president-medvedev-urges-the-u-s-to-abandon-the-jackson-vanik-amendment/2642

But he then continued onto a more controversial issue. “It’s very good to be back in Russia. I am both a student of and a respecter of the great traditions of a great power. The first Russian leader I met with was Brezhnev. That’s how old I am. To further age myself, I knew both Jackson and Vanik. I think that’s why President Obama keeps me around,” Biden said, according to a transcript provided by the Kremlin. Biden was referring to former U.S. Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson and U.S. Congressman Charles Vanik, who in 1974 authored legislation that was intended to pressure the Soviet Union to allow more Jewish emigration by denying a so-called most favored nation trade status to countries that restrict emigration. The Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was signed into law by former U.S. President Gerald Ford, remains a major irritant and controversial issue in U.S.-Russian relations as the law remains in force, although it has been regularly waived in recent years. Medvedev immediately jumped in on Biden’s reference to the law. “I would just like to express hope that the next time you come to our nation – which I hope will happen soon – at least one of the topics you’ve mentioned will be left in the past,” he said. “I am referring to the Jackson-Vanik amendment, because this is an issue that always comes up during your visits. I hope that this will be the last time. After all, you cannot keep dealing with it throughout your entire career.”

#### Russian PNTR good – key to relations and Russian ascension to the WTO

David Harris, writer for the NYT, Director of the American Jewish Committee, 7-15-2010, “End a Cold War Relic,” http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/16/opinion/16iht-edharris.html

Washington is sending the wrong message to Moscow, especially at a time of improving bilateral ties between our two countries and growing cooperation on such pressing issues as Iran’s nuclear program. It also raises questions about our credibility. Today, no one doubts that Russians who wish to emigrate have the right to do so. Apropos, if millions were to exercise that option, it is absolutely certain that the U.S. would not admit all, or even most of them. Meanwhile, Russia and Israel have signed a visa-free agreement, meaning that citizens of both countries can travel back and forth without a visa, another sign of the free movement of people. Three successive American presidents — Clinton, Bush and Obama — have supported the graduation of Russia from the strictures of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, but, regrettably, without results to date. The obstacle lies in Congress. Some legislators, perhaps with no recollection of the amendment’s original intent, have viewed it as an all-purpose vehicle for expressing opposition to particular Russian policies. Most striking has been the American poultry industry effort to use the amendment to force Moscow to purchase imported chickens. This is absurd. If Russia is placing barriers in the path of our exports, or posing other problems, then by all means address the question directly, but not in such a roundabout way. The recent spy swap demonstrates how today the two countries have the capacity to deal successfully with difficult issues. Lifting the Jackson-Vanik Amendment would acknowledge that what was sought in 1974, emigration, has been achieved. It would demonstrate that our word counts for something on this issue and that we are not going to move the goal posts at will. It would recognize the forward march of history. Some argue that the legislative battle is not worth pursuing now. They assert that Congress will in any case need to graduate Russia from the amendment as part of Moscow’s eventual accession to the World Trade Organization. But that’s the back-door route, creating the impression that it is being done grudgingly.

### Relations Good – Everything

#### Relations prevent nuke war – cooperation key to stability everywhere

Stephen F. Cohen, professor of Russian studies at NYU, 3-8-2012, “America's Failed (Bi-Partisan) Russia Policy,” The Nation, http://www.thenation.com/article/166692/americas-failed-bi-partisan-russia-policy

First: Today, as before, the road to America's national security runs through Moscow. No other US bilateral relationship is more vital. The reasons should be known to every policymaker, though they seem not to be: - Russia's enormous stockpiles of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction make it the only country capable of destroying the United States as well as the only other government, along with our own, essential for preventing the proliferation of such weapons. - There is also Russia's disproportionate share of the world's essential resources, not only oil and natural gas but metals, fertile land, timber, fresh water and more, which give Moscow critical importance in the global economy. - In addition, Russia remains the world's largest territorial country. In particular, the geopolitical significance of its location on the Eurasian frontier of today's mounting conflicts between Western and Eastern civilizations, as well as its own millions of Islamic people, can hardly be overstated. - Not to be forgotten are Russia's talented and nationalistic people, even in bad times, and their state's traditions in international affairs. This too means that Russia will play a major role in the world. - And, largely as a result of these circumstances, there is Moscow's special capacity to abet or to thwart US interests in many regions of the world, from Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea and China to Europe, the entire Middle East and Latin America.

### Relations Good – Everything

#### Russia is key to everything

Graam Allison, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School, October, 2011, “Russia and U.S. National Interests,” https://docs.google.com/a/whitman.edu/viewer?a=v&q=cache:v1As8GeyxbsJ:www.cftni.org/Russia-and-US-NI\_final-web.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjmHeNTG3fphu7JCW-dkYSxdPpJQE213NF0RAJug9sqKqxnQo2yjbhrZ3smFx9YECiKIuU1hnheuV9wxI1ZrWppy\_ur6jJZytf0uBTP5g5edCU5uHlwvzW7n0aQN-\_iLYV7-7\_h&sig=AHIEtbSK62thEDk-oXR-yHG5cAQ8DsZdXw&pli=1

Two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union and Russia’s emergence as an independent state, Moscow is no longer America’s strategic rival. Yet, while Russia is not our enemy, neither has it become a friend. Washington and Moscow have succeeded in overcoming Cold War confrontation, but have not developed sustainable cooperative relations. A better-managed bilateral relationship is critical for the advancement of America’s vital national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return to the Kremlin as Russia’s President next year does not change U.S. national interests with respect to Russia or, for that matter, Russia’s national interests with respect to the United States. Still, at a minimum, Russia’s rhetoric vis-à-vis America and the West may become tougher under Putin. Under the circumstances, maintaining the proper focus in U.S.-Russian relations will likely require particular care and determination from U.S. policymakers. This report, the result of deliberations by a distinguished working group of former senior officials and military officers, business leaders, and top experts, analyzes the U.S.-Russia relationship through the lens of American national interests; argues that Russia is a pivotal country in promoting these U.S. national interests; and offers prescriptions for U.S. policy toward Russia in the period ahead. America’s Vital National Interests Although politicians and pundits routinely invoke the concept of vital national interests to justify virtually any desired course of action, we hold to a narrow view of U.S. vital interests. Specifically, vital national interests are conditions that are strictly necessary to safeguard and enhance Americans’ survival and well-being in a free and secure nation. From this perspective, we can identify five American vital national interests: Preventing the use and slowing the spread of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass • destruction, securing nuclear weapons and materials, and preventing proliferation of intermediate and long-range delivery systems for nuclear weapons; Russia and U.S. National Interests Why Should Americans Care? Maintaining a balance of power in Europe and Asia that promotes peace and stability with • a continuing U.S. leadership role; • Preventing large-scale or sustained terrorist attacks on the American Homeland; Ensuring energy security; and • • Assuring the stability of the international economy. Why Russia Matters to the United States In view of Russia’s difficult history, sometimes troubling behavior, relatively small economy, and reduced international role since the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is reasonable to ask whether the United States needs Moscow as a partner. We believe Russia must be a top priority for the United States because its conduct can have a profound impact on America’s vital national interests: Nuclear Weapons. President Barack Obama and former President George W. Bush each • identified nuclear terrorism as the number one threat to American national security. The United States and Russia together possess 95% of the world’s nuclear weapons and most of the world’s weapons-usable material, and both are major suppliers of civilian nuclear technologies around the world. Also, Russia is the only nation that could destroy America as we know it in thirty minutes. Russia’s meaningful assistance and support is critical to preventing nuclear war. Non-Proliferation. Russia plays a key role in U.S.-led international efforts to inhibit • the spread of nuclear weapons, weapons-usable materials and technologies, which are sought not only by nation states, but also by non-state actors. Moscow has generally supported American initiatives to combat nuclear terrorism and shared intelligence on al Qaeda with Washington. Without Russia’s assistance, the United States will face considerable additional difficulties in seeking to slow down nuclear proliferation and prevent nuclear terrorism. Geopolitics. Russia is an important nation in today’s international system. Aligning • Moscow more closely with American goals would bring significant balance of power advantages to the United States—including in managing China’s emergence as a global power. Ignoring Russian perspectives can have substantial costs. Russia’s vote in the United Nations Security Council and its influence elsewhere is consequential to the success of U.S. international diplomacy on a host of issues. Afghanistan. Al Qaeda operatives have engaged in terrorist attacks against the United • States and have encouraged and supported attacks by domestic terrorist groups in Russia. Russia has provided the United States with access to its airspace and territory as a critical alternative supply route for U.S. forces in Afghanistan, something that has grown in importance as America’s relations with Pakistan have deteriorated. Moscow has also shared intelligence on Afghanistan and al Qaeda, helps to train Afghan law enforcement officers, and supplies hardware to them and to the Afghan National Army. Energy. Russia is one of the world’s leading energy producers and is the top holder of • natural gas reserves .Russia thus has a substantial role in maintaining and expanding energy supplies that keep the global economy stable and enable economic growth in the United States and around the world. Finance. Russia’s membership in the G8 and the G20 gives it a seat at the table for the most • important financial and economic meetings and deliberations. Strategic Geography. Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area and the largest in • Europe by population. It is located at a strategic crossroads between Europe, Asia, and the greater Middle East and is America’s neighbor in the Arctic. As a result, Russia is close to trouble-spots and a critical transit corridor for energy and other goods. Reviewing these areas makes clear that Russia’s choices and actions impact the full range of vital U.S. national interests significantly and directly. Few other nations are as important to the United States.

### AT: Putin Dooms Relations

#### Putin puts relations on the brink – doesn’t kill them

Steven Pifer, senior fellow, foreign policy, center on the United States and Europe, Brookings, 3-5-2012, “What Putin’s Return to the Presidency Means for U.S.-Russia Relations,” Brookings, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0305\_russia\_pifer.aspx

The upshot is that Putin’s return could and probably will mean more bumpiness in the U.S.-Russia relationship. He will pursue his view of Russian interests. On certain issues, those will conflict with U.S. interests, and Washington and Moscow will disagree, perhaps heatedly. Putin’s style will differ markedly from Medvedev’s. But he is not likely to seek to turn the relationship upside down or take it back to the grim days of 2008. For all the rhetoric now, we should not rule out that the American president will be able to deal with Putin.

#### Putin’s anti-american stance will soft post election

Dick Krickus, distinguished professor emeritus at the University of Mary Washington, former H.L. Oppenheimer Chair for Warfighting Strategy at the U.S. Marine Corps University, 2-3-2012, “United States Looms Large in Russian Elections,” CDI, http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/russia-us-looms-large-russian-election-336.cfm

At the same time, Putin-watchers claim that his surging anti-American rhetoric Â­ with the help of the maniacal Dmitry Rogozin Â­ is meant for a domestic, not a foreign audience. Consider in this connection Putin's assertion that Clinton has "inspired" the anti-government protestors; that McFaul's support for the "reset" is merely a fig leaf to hide his enmity toward Moscow; and that Obama, like George Bush, deems Russia an American "vassal." Such attacks win votes in Russia's heartland just like similar paranoia works in behalf of American candidates in Dixie. Nikolai Zlobin of the Washington-based World Security Institute has observed: "His foreign policy is not more anti-American than that of many international leaders that speak of America very positively." This view has many supporters among Russia-watchers who opine that once Putin is reelected president in March, he will dial-back his anti-Americanism and get about the important business of finding areas of cooperation with Washington.

#### Putin backs the reset – the US president is key

Andrew C. Kuchins, Director, Russia and Eurasia Program, CSIS, 11-2-2011, “Russia-U.S. relations after 2012 elections,” RIA Novosti, http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20111102/168361206.html

Do you expect that the relationships between the two countries will undergo drastic changes after 2012 elections in both countries? I do not think they will undergo drastic changes after the 2012 elections in Russia. I think, that president Medvedev and prime-minister Putin are basically in agreement about the advisability of the, so called “reset” of the Russian-US relations that has taken place over the last nearly three years. I think the much bigger question mark is: what is going to happen in the US elections? If Barak Obama is reelected, then, I think, we will see basically continuation of the policy. From my point of view, the “reset” has been successful. The relationship has been reset. We have now more normal and constructive relationship with Russia, as we should have. I think, we are not going to have that momentum of watershed agreements, (and one of them I forgot to mention, of course, the Civilian Nuclear-1, -2, -3 agreement, which was concluded at the end of last year). Still I think trying to build on the levels of cooperation that we have would be the case with the Obama administration. Republican administration is a much bigger question mark.

## Elections DA
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#### Obama will win in November now

Mark Schoeff, 5-30-2012, “Advisers back Romney,” Investment News, http://www.investmentnews.com/article/20120530/FREE/120539985

Election Day is still months away, but investment advisers are already convinced that the candidate they want to win the presidency, Republican Mitt Romney, will lose. In a survey of 125 advisers conducted May 7-8 at the SEI National Strategic Advisor Conference, 74% back Mr. Romney, who effectively wrapped up the Republican presidential nomination with a win in Tuesday's Texas primary. Their votes for him, though, will probably be for naught, the advisers indicated. By 63% to 37%, they expect Mr. Obama to win re-election. In addition, 59% anticipate that the government will remain split, with the GOP winning the House and the Senate or White House.

#### < INSERT LINK - Plan is unpopular with the public >

#### Obama is winning, but it’s close – loss of popularity can still swing the election. Prefer our evidence – it’s based on the strongest possible model

David Rothschild, PhD Economics @ Wharton, 3-2-2012, “Romney has no chance in Massachusetts,” Yahoo News, http://news.yahoo.com/blogs/signal/romney-lose-massachusetts-november-why-math-wrong-171308063.html

Two weeks ago, we unveiled our model of presidential elections based on data from the past ten election cycles, which currently predicts that President Obama has a fragile advantage over his eventual opponent. We currently project that the president will win 303 electoral votes in November. But if the economic or job approval numbers slide backward even a few ticks, he loses the election by a hair. Today we'd like to examine one rather glaring error in the model and explain why we're not going to fix it: Massachusetts stands at 74.4 percent likely to go to Obama, while all external signs dictate that it is a much safer bet for the Democrats. This is because we currently assume Mitt Romney will win the nomination, as the prediction markets suggest. There is overwhelming empirical evidence that presidential candidates get abnormal returns in their home state. In 1984, for example, Walter Mondale still won Minnesota even though the other 49 states all went to Ronald Reagan. (Mondale also held down Washington, D.C.) So Yahoo! Labs' Patrick Hummel and I tested this theory with data from the last ten election cycles. We determined the size of that abnormal return, calibrated on those past races. This boost shifts Massachusetts from a Democratic lock to a Democratic-leaning state. It currently flips for Romney if Obama's approval rating falls to 41 percent, well before similar states. Not only has Massachusetts voted Democratic in the last six presidential elections, but it has also done so overwhelmingly. The state's House delegation is all Democratic. Scott Brown, who won a special election for Ted Kennedy's former Senate seat, is the only Republican representing the state on the federal level, and Elizabeth Warren is 68.6 percent likely to take that seat off his hands this fall. George McGovern even won the state in 1972, another year when the Republican incumbent (Richard Nixon) won 49 states. Furthermore, Romney has widely distanced himself from Massachusetts' liberal image, especially when health care comes up. The health care law that Romney signed as governor, which bears many similarities to Obama's national initiative, is widely popular in Massachusetts . But Romney has declared that his first act as president would be to toss out the so-called "Obamacare" legislation. Here we have an empirical study of the data clashing with anecdotal political wisdom, and it's tempting, of course, to work in some fudge factor, or arbitrarily decide that Romney's real home state is Utah, the nexus of his Mormon faith. But our model will be judged by academia on its statistical significance, not on what it predicts in 2012, with a twofold goal. First, we want to create the most accurate forecast possible several months before there is enough accuracy in polls and prediction markets to use that data for predictions. Second, we want to provide a data-driven look at the real correlation between all the data points--economic growth, incumbency, regional affiliation, and so forth--that are constantly debated in the press and academia. As the election season progresses, we will incorporate more polling and prediction market data into our state-by-state presidential predictions. These data points will help correct any 2012 anomalies that cannot be observed by historical data. At present, historical data is the most accurate predictor of the election--regardless of any temptation to tamper with its findings when it conflicts with our human instincts.

### 1NC Elections DA 2/2

#### GOP win causes Iran strikes

Emine Dilek, addicting info, “All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran,” 9-20-11 http://www.addictinginfo.org/2011/09/20/all-republican-candidates-favor-war-with-iran/

Prepare yourself my fellow Americans. If you elect a Republican President in the 2012 elections, more than likely we will be at war with Iran before his or her Presidency is over. In a disturbing new article written by Trita Parsi, a columnist for Salon.com, he expertly connects the dots on which single foreign policy issue is uniting all GOP candidates: Iran. He writes that when it comes to Arab Spring and all other foreign policy issues, GOP candidates are all over the place. But when it is about Iran, they all agree; USA must be tougher. Parsi asserts that “Republicans will present a narrative that diplomacy was tried and failed, sanctions are tough but insufficient, and the only remaining option is some form of military action. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.” Although I agree with Parsi’s claim that Iran is the only foreign policy matter that unites all GOP candidates, I do not believe the memory of Iraq invasion is slowly fading. Contrary to his assertion, I believe Americans are fed up with the unending wars.

#### Extinction

Jorge Hirsch, Professor of physics at the University of California San Diego, 2-20-2006, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss –The United States is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit. We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us.

### Yes Obama 2012

#### Obama will win now – has advantages

Mark Schoeff, 5-30-2012, “Advisers back Romney,” Investment News, http://www.investmentnews.com/article/20120530/FREE/120539985

On a list of seven issues, the respondents chose “log jams in Congress,” “entitlements” and “tax increases in 2013” as the topics that worry them the most. These areas beat out interest rates, gas prices, unemployment and housing. “I'm not surprised they want Romney, given their concern over the deficit and entitlements,” said Steve Onofrio, managing director of the SEI Advisor Network, a provider of investment, administrative and practice management services for independent advisers. But advisers are also politically savvy, according to Mr. Onofrio. They know that Mr. Obama will be hard to beat, if he can reignite the enthusiasm of the political base that propelled him into office in 2008. “They're saying Obama has the machine and the backing of a number of key constituencies,” Mr. Onofrio said.

#### Obama winning – youth vote

C.C. Gong, 4-25-2012, “Obama Takes the Lead in New IOP Poll,” Harvard Crimson, http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2012/4/25/obama-takes-lead/

In a new national poll of America’s youngest voting demographic conducted by Harvard’s Institute of Politics in late March and early April, 43 percent of 18- to 29-year-olds said that they believe the President will win re-election. “The way the primary played out, there is a belief right now that Obama has a better shot,” Institute of Politics Director C.M. “Trey” Grayson ’94 said. “Compared to the last poll, his approval ratings have improved. Overall there is just a more optimistic outlook for Obama.” Republical presidential hopeful Mitt Romney, however, is struggling to reach this demographic. In this new poll, only 26 percent of 18- to 29-year-olds said that they planned to support him in the 2012 election. “I was struck that Mitt Romney’s numbers didn’t move that much,” Grayson said. “However, he obviously has a better chance over the next few months to reposition himself. It was a nasty primary, and they really went head to head, but now he can focus more on the campaign for President. His number is not lower, he just lost a few months to sway voters.” Obama’s current 17 percent lead among 18- to 29-year-olds accompanies a six percent increase in support from an IOP poll conducted in late November, in which 37 percent of those polled at the time said that they would most likely support Obama and 26 percent said that they would vote for Romney. The new national poll also indicated that while the health of the economy remains a primary concern for 18- to 29-year-old voters, the percentage of young Americans who believe economic conditions are improving has increased from 12 percent to 20 percent since the last poll was conducted in late November.

### Yes Obama 2012

#### Obama will win – likeability and history

Aaron David Miller, scholar @ Woodrow Wilson, 4-25-2012, “5 Reasons Obama Will Win in November,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/25/5\_reasons\_obama\_will\_win\_in\_november

Worrying about getting reelected is part of a president's job description, but this president really shouldn't be all that concerned. The election is bound to be closer than in 2008, but when it's over, the presidential gods will likely have smiled kindly on Barack Obama. Here are the top five reasons why. 1. Americans are reelecting imperfect and flawed presidents. I know it's going to come as a shocker, but Obama hasn't been a great president in his first term and is unlikely to be one in his second. His two claims to fame -- saving the economy from another Great Depression and passing his signature health-care legislation -- won't get him there. The first will largely be taken for granted, and the second is still a very uncertain and untested proposition. The president's foreign policy has been very competent, but aside from the killing of Osama bin Laden, it has had no spectacular successes. But what's so great about being great anyway? Greatness is certainly not a requirement for reelection. The last two U.S. presidents -- Bill Clinton and George W. Bush -- were reelected comfortably, and neither could hardly be considered a candidate for the presidential hall of fame. Both were flawed and imperfect men: Obama's predecessor was below average; Clinton clearly above average. That's about where Obama falls too. Consider this: Since Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United States has had four presidents who served out two terms: Eisenhower, Reagan, Clinton, and Bush 43. Even with a push from partisans and revisionist historians, none really belongs in the very top tier. 2. Obama has history on his side. Since 1980, only one U.S. president has failed to gain a second term. That was George H.W. Bush, who defied the odds by succeeding a two-term president of the same party. Since FDR, this has happened only once. It's a tough hill to climb. Americans generally tire of too much single-party dominance. Indeed, that's why Hillary Clinton should take a very hard look at her chances in 2016 -- should Obama be reelected. A set of three presidents -- Clinton, Bush 43, and perhaps Obama -- is hardly a valid statistical sample, but it does tell you something about the power of the incumbent. It's hard to defeat a sitting president. Although a bad economy offsets some of the incumbent's advantage, Americans tend to get comfortable with their presidents. Presidents are also able to act presidential right up to Election Day. The presidency has a great many bells and whistles, including the White House, which Aaron Sorkin's West Wing president once described as the world's greatest home-court advantage. There's also the issue of continuity. These days, U.S. state and congressional politics have gotten pretty combustible and polarized. The media circus at the national level only makes things seem more out of control. As Americans watch their politics implode, they seem to be seeking a measure of stability in the one institution that they all have responsibility for shaping -- the presidency. In these turbulent times, Americans tend to stay with their guys, flawed as those guys may be. Should Obama be reelected, it will only be the second time in U.S. history that America has had three two-term presidents in a row. The last time? Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. "Throw the bums out" doesn't seem to be as compelling a line these days. 3. The guy's a mensch (kind of). If location, location, location is the key to success in the real estate business, then being liked -- cubed -- plays a big part in a president's success too. When Americans choose a president, they do so partly on the basis that they're inviting him (or her, someday) to be part of their lives for four and possibly eight years. This means being able to like the person and be comfortable with him. Forget whether the candidate is brilliant -- the most overrated quality in the presidency. Can he be trusted? Is he trying to do the right thing? Is he arrogant and out of touch, or likable and down to earth? Can one imagine spending an hour with the president and not having to look down at one's shoes for the entire conversation? Think about whom you'd want to spend time with: Bill Clinton or Bob Dole; Ronald Reagan or Jimmy Carter. If the president has a normal family life, that helps too, particularly if he's got a cool wife, cute kids, and a dog. Obama can appear detached, even cold, at times. More often, though, he's accessible and sincere. You'll never convince the birthers, racists, and Obama-haters that he's anything other than an alien president. But back on planet Earth, most Americans, according to recent polling, see him as more likable, more in touch with the needs of average people, than Republican candidate Mitt Romney. He's good on his feet and appears pretty comfortable in his own skin. That's the elusive quality of emotional intelligence. Are you in balance? Can you relate to others, keep your demons and insecurities under control, and stay out of trouble? Obama gets high marks in this important category. 4. The Republicans are weak and divided. You can't beat something with nothing. That old saw in politics wins out most every time. The Republican Party has never gotten over its love affair with Reagan. Look at the parade of Republican hopefuls who rose and fell during primary season. Had Reagan been around, he'd have been frustrated with the divisions in Republican ranks. And the Gipper might have described the primaries as an audition in which the last guy standing got the part only because the producers were exhausted and needed to get the play into rehearsals before the opening. I know the main counterpoint: Republicans will come together because they need to defeat Obama. But the gaps between the Republican base and the centrists are huge; the obsession with social issues risks alienating independents; there are real doubts that Romney is conservative enough; and there's not much enthusiasm for his stiff style on the campaign trail. All this is creating real trouble for a party that seems to have lost its way. Add to that Republican difficulties in making inroads with women and Hispanics, and you might conclude that the election is Obama's to lose. 5. The economy: bad, but Obama wins on points. Clearly, much will depend on how voters perceive their economic reality closer to the election. Obama really isn't running against Romney -- he's running against the economy. By the fall, it's likely that about the best he'll have to show is a weak recovery. Indeed, the New York Times reported last week that when it comes to the economy, the all-important Ohio voters see Romney vs. Obama as an unpalatable choice between liver and Brussels sprouts. Still, when Americans vote for a president, they ask themselves two questions: To what degree is the guy in the White House responsible for my misery? And if I vote for the other guy, can he really make it better? Barring another economic meltdown, I'm betting that enough Americans will conclude that things are getting better, albeit slowly; that Obama is doing the best job he can under tough circumstances; that the president is much more attuned to those who are suffering; and that the Republicans have neither better answers on the economy nor a compelling-enough candidate worth giving the benefit of the doubt. So don't worry too much, Mr. President. You may not be getting into the presidential hall of fame, but it looks like you're going to get another shot to try.

### Yes Obama 2012 – AT: Economy

#### Economy and public perception of Obama is turning around – massive improvement

Charles E. Cook, Jr., Spring 2012, “Have President Obama’s Re-Election Prospects Brightened?”, The Washington Quarterly, http://www.twq.com/12spring/docs/12spring\_cook.pdf

Not all of these factors have changed but there are growing signs that some have changed or might be changing. They offer, at least, enough evidence to warrant watching very closely. The economy grew at a three percent pace in the fourth quarter of 2011. This rate was hardly a blistering pace but was far better than the GDP growth rate has been. The unemployment rate dropped five months in a row, and held steady in a sixth. While it is still unacceptably high, it’s showing a direction that we haven’t seen in a while. Over that same period, the mix of positive to negative economic news, from headline numbers to more arcane indicators like railroad car loadings, has created a positive buzz among the public.The Thomson Reuters/University of Michigan’s Index of Consumer Sentiment reported in February that consumer confidence had reached 75.3, the highest since February of 2011 and substantially above the 55.7 last August. The Conference Board’s Consumer Confidence Index is similarly up to its highest levels since last February. Its overall rate is the highest since April. The public’s assessment of its present situation is the highest in more than a year, and its expectations for the future are also the highest since last May. The Gallup Organization reported that economic confidence in February marked the sixth straight month that public confidence has increased and almost matches the highest monthly levels seen in the last four years, though still in negative territory. With these better economic numbers and more hopeful consumer confidence ratings, the January NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll showed that 33 percent believed the country was heading in the right direction. This percentage was the highest since last May. The wrong track number was down to 58 percent, the lowest since May. These are still troubling numbers but reflect a public that badly wants hopeful news. President Obama’s approval rating in the NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll had been upside down: 44 percent approved and 48 percent disapproved in both the August and October polls. These numbers have improved a bit to 50 percent approve and 45 percent disapprove. The Gallup Poll’s monthly approval averages had been 43 percent or less since August; Gallup’s monthly averages for January, February and the first week of March were 45 percent. These are unimpressive numbers and not indicative of an incumbent who is likely to win.The pattern, though, is different and more favorable to the president than what we saw during the last half of 2011. It is worth keeping track of. It is important to note that not all indicators are improving. One economic yardstick that is worth watching is Real Personal Disposable Income (RPDI)that is, how much money are people making after taxes and inflation. Whether looking at RPDI on a per capita basis or overall change from a year earlier, it’s leveled off. It has improved ever so slightly, but Americans have lost a lot of ground over the last year. Things haven’t turned around on that important measurement. Historically, this is the best economic predictor of an incumbent president’s performance. If that number improves in a meaningful way, it would be an important marker that Obama has turned a corner. However, many top economists are not convinced that this is a real economic turnaround. If it is real, they wonder how durable it is, given the likelihood of Europe sliding into a recession. There are also prospects of an even greater financial crisis across the Atlantic and slowing economic growth around the world. The interconnectedness of the U.S. economy makes economic developments elsewhere more relevant than ever before. International headwinds are potentially strong enough to offset such a fragile economic turnaround. At the same time, we’ve seen nominal upward movement in the economic data.

### Yes Obama 2012 – AT: Economy

#### Economy’s turning around – hurts GOP message, helps Obama win

Alex Leary, 3-19-2012, “Improving economy complicates Republican message but picture still tough for President Barack Obama”, Tampa Bay Times, http://www.tampabay.com/news/business/article1220387.ece

Mitt Romney stood in an industrial manufacturing plant attacking President Barack Obama. "He's a nice guy, but he's in over his head," Romney said. "We need to have a president who understands the economy if we're going to fix the economy." The campaign arranged for plant employees to sit behind Romney, stagecraft that would play well on TV a day before Ohio's crucial Republican presidential primary this month. But the workers provided a different script. "Times were tough around here," 35-year-old Chris Marrone said in an interview. "Everybody was nervous, but we're starting to see orders coming in." A slow but measurable economic comeback — from lower unemployment to a soaring stock market, higher auto sales and daily improvement in battered areas like Youngstown — is complicating the Republican game plan. Unemployment, still dangerously high at 8.3 percent, and the economy remain voters' top concerns and Obama's chief re-election obstacle, but the issue is less of a wedge. "It's a jump ball," said Republican economist Doug Holtz-Eakin. As the GOP candidates campaign across key swing states, their gloom clashes with upbeat assessments from Republican governors, such as Ohio's John Kasich and Florida's Rick Scott, who tout job growth and falling unemployment. The mixed signals have forced candidates to tweak their message. "You know, the economy may be getting better and Republicans may lose their edge on that issue," Rick Santorum, Romney's top rival, told Missouri voters recently. Santorum, among others, is shifting his focus to similarities between the health care plan Romney ushered in as governor of Massachusetts and the national program adopted under Obama. "Obamacare should be the No. 1 issue in the campaign. I think it's the gift that keeps giving," Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., told the Weekly Standard. Romney, who has been dragged into emotional arguments over birth control and immigration as he strains to win over conservatives, has tried to refocus his message. "We are going to campaign on the economy. After any recession, the country rebounds," spokesman Ryan Williams said, asserting Obama's policies have prolonged the hardship. He said Santorum's position is evidence he's an "economic lightweight" and disagreed that Romney's message clashed with the governors. "We obviously think more could have been done on the federal level to promote our economic recovery." Even so, three consecutive months of strong job growth, including 227,000 added in February, have taken some bite out of Romney's message. He's adjusted by emphasizing the millions still looking for work, including veterans, and higher gas prices, which Newt Gingrich has made the exclusive focus of his fading campaign. Gasoline has reached $4 a gallon in parts of the country and the pain is expected to persist. Obama has launched an aggressive effort to ascribe the spike to factors out of his hands, such as turmoil in the Middle East, a hard sell even if experts agree. "Right now a lot of Americans are expecting the economy to get better and that helps the president," said Sen. John McCain, who lost to Obama in 2008. "But when they go to the gas pump and see where it is, that makes it more difficult." Despite higher fuel costs, retail spending increased in February by 1.1 percent, the biggest gain since September. But Obama's chastened reaction shows the degree of worry that gas prices could have on his re-election. Polls have been volatile — a New York Times/CBS News poll last week showed his approval rating at 41 percent while a National Journal survey put it at 51 percent. But the National Journal poll showed that 60 percent of Americans anticipate improvement over the coming year, up from 50 percent in October. The president faces a delicate task of not seeming too confident yet trying to take credit for the improvements. He tried to walk the line during a March 9 speech at a manufacturing facility in Petersburg, Va., acknowledging that Americans are still hurting while expressing confidence the rebound will continue. "Our job now is to keep this economic engine churning," Obama said. "We can't go back to the same policies that got us into this mess. We can't go back to an economy that was weakened by outsourcing and bad debt and phony financial profits." Obama made a similar argument in the 2010 midterm elections, but it fell flat against tea-party-fueled anger about rising spending and debt. Republicans swept those elections and took control of the House, crippling the Democratic agenda. This time, though, Obama has distinct signs of recovery. His campaign on Thursday released a documentary-style, 17-minute film tracing the steps to shore up the economy. "Obviously if the economy improves it puts people in a better mood and they are more likely to vote for the incumbent," said John Feehery, a Republican strategist in Washington.

### Yes Obama 2012 – AT: Economy

#### Economic winds are changing – key to independent vote for Obama

Charles E. Cook, Jr., Spring 2012, “Have President Obama’s Re-Election Prospects Brightened?”, The Washington Quarterly, http://www.twq.com/12spring/docs/12spring\_cook.pdf

We’ve seen Republicans go through 21 debates with increasingly over-heated rhetoric and positions on key issues often taken to curry favor with the conservative base of the Republican Party. It’s hardly shocking that the GOP presidential contenders are chasing after Tea Party voters through the primary process. However, independent voters might find it off-putting: those non-aligned voters who are neither conservative nor liberal had turned against Obama because the economy was doing so badly. They could plausibly be turning back with better economic news. At this juncture, it once again appears clear that fundamentalssuch as campaign organization and money, advanced planning, and groundworkstill matter. The laws of gravity still apply. That is a roundabout way of saying that the factors that made Mitt Romney the favorite for the Republican nomination early last fall are still in place. Clearly Romney is encountering substantial difficulty within the GOP, but at this point it is a battle over delegates and it is increasingly unlikely that Senator Rick Santorum or the former speaker Newt Gingrich will be able to over take him. When you get into mid-March and have accumulated more delegates than the rest of the field combined, as Romney has, and in place after place, your rivals are not on the ballot in whole states or file delegate slates in Congressional districts, forfeiting the chance to win delegates there, the race is coming to an effective close. More importantly however, while Romney’s favorable-unfavorable ratings among Republican voters are still strong, there is more or a preference for a more ideologically pure and stylistically bombastic nominee than Romney. The key is preference not opposition. Republicans want something bolder and angrier than Romney but his rivals and not sufficiently strong to tap into those preferences on a consistent basis. More problematic for Romney is that his negatives among independent voters have skyrocketed, as a fundamentally centrist candidate has had to reposition himself as someone far more conservative than his nature to win the nomination, but alienating less ideological independents in the process. This will require substantial repair work over the summer. This also comes at a time when the Republican Party’s ‘‘brand’’ has taken a beating, the cumulative effect of a party that has become obsessed with its conservative base and the Tea Party movement without any regard toward the alienation among moderates and less ideologically inclined independents, many of whom are disappointed by President Obama’s performance in office but are growing increasingly skeptical about the GOP. At best one can describe Romney’s debate performances as uneven. They are sometimes disappointing to his supporters. They give rise to concerns among Republican strategists, who concede that he has had difficulty meeting expectations that existed a few months ago. Republicans hope that this trial by fire will result in Romney being a stronger and tougher general election candidate than he would have been had the nomination been handed to him on a silver platter. This idea recalls Obama’s vast improvement as a candidate, having fought Hillary Clinton to the final round. Overall circumstances in individual Senate and House races have shown a little movement as a result of nominal economic improvements and the slight upward drift in President Obama’s numbers. If it continued, it would be just cause for Republicans to worry and for Democratic hopes to rise. There has been some recent national polling data giving Democrats reason to claim that the winds have turned decisively in their direction.

### AT: Too Far Off to Predict

#### Our predictions models don’t have to be perfectly accurate to a provide a pretty good idea of who will win

John Sides, political scientist, PHD, 3-29-2012, “In Defense of Presidential Forecasting Models,” Five Thirty Eight, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/29/in-defense-of-presidential-forecasting-models/

But I am less critical of the accuracy of these models than is Nate. For one, forecasters have different motives in constructing these models. Some are interested in the perfect forecast, a goal that may create incentives to make ad hoc adjustments to the model. Others are more interested in theory testing — that is, seeing how well election results conform to political science theories about the effects of the economy and other “fundamentals.” Models grounded in theory won’t be (or at least shouldn’t be) adjusted ad hoc. If so, then their out-of-sample predictions could prove less accurate, on average, but perfect prediction wasn’t the goal to begin with. I haven’t talked with each forecaster individually, so I do not know what each one’s goals are. I am just suggesting that, for scholars, the agenda is sometimes broader than simple forecasting. Second, as Nate acknowledges but doesn’t fully explore (at least not in this post), the models vary in their accuracy. The average error in predicting the two-party vote is 4.6 points for Ray Fair’s model, but only 1.72 points for Alan Abramowitz’s model. In other words, some appear better than others — and we should be careful not to condemn the entire enterprise because some models are more inaccurate. Third, if we look at the models in a different way, they arguably do a good enough job. Say that you just want to know who is going to win the presidential election, not whether this candidate will get 51 percent or 52 percent of the vote. Of the 58 separate predictions that Nate tabulates, 85 percent of them correctly identified the winner — even though most forecasts were made two months or more before the election and even though few of these forecasts actually incorporated trial heat polls from the campaign. This view reflects my “forest, not the trees” approach to consuming these models. I assume that any individual model will always have errors. I assume that although some forecasters are historically more accurate than others, no one has some special forecasting sauce that makes his model the best. So when I see a range of forecasts, I tend to look at the direction that forecast is pointing. That tells me who is likely to win. Looked at this way, the “forest” will rarely lead me astray in “Dewey Defeats Truman” fashion. Perhaps that’s a low bar, but that’s all I am looking for. (And, as Election Day draws closer, there will always be purely poll-based forecasts to draw on as well, both nationally and within states.) To be sure, the forest-not-trees approach does not render criticisms of forecasting models irrelevant. Moreover, forecasters themselves often use “the trees” — i.e., errors in any one model’s predictions — to evaluate the models. So Nate is entirely justified in using these metrics himself. I am also not suggesting that problems in forecast models should be ignored as long as they get the winner right — after all, some models called the winner correctly but overestimated his vote share by 10 points — or that the models cannot be improved, or that there might be better ways of forecasting elections than any of these models. I am simply suggesting that viewed at a distance, the models will rarely “fail” (as the headline of Nate’s post has it) in a way that misleads the average person who follows politics and wants to know only who’s the likely winner, but doesn’t care about root-mean-square error.

### AT: Too Far Off To Predict

#### Not too early to make elections predictions

David Rothschild, PhD Economics @ Wharton, 3-2-2012, “Two economist from Yahoo Labs,” IEEE, http://spectrum.ieee.org/podcast/at-work/innovation/obama-wins

But the mother lode of predictions this year is the 2012 U.S. elections. Two billion dollars might easily be spent between now and November, so if you think it’s too soon to predict Super Bowl XLVI, you probably also think it’s too early to call the presidential race. You’d be wrong. President Obama will be reelected with 303 votes in the Electoral College, winning 26 states and the District of Columbia, including California and New York by wide margins and squeaking out a win in key battleground states Ohio, by 50.3 percent, and Pennsylvania, by just under 52 percent. So predict two economists at Yahoo Labs, Patrick Hummel and David Rothschild , who is my guest today. He has a Ph.D. in applied economics from the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, where his dissertation involved creating forecasts just like this one. He’s been with Yahoo Labs, in New York City, since May of last year, and he joins us by phone from there. David, welcome to the podcast. David Rothschild: Thank you very much for having me. Steven Cherry: David, maybe the most striking thing about your election model is that it doesn’t really know who the Republican candidate is—and almost doesn’t care. But before we get to that, maybe you could tell us about modeling in general and how yours was built. David Rothschild: Sure. This is a fundamental model, and the basis of fundamental models are dropping out polls and prediction markets and thinking about fundamental data that’s available well before the election. And so this is based off such things as presidential approval ratings in mid-June, economic indicators, incumbency, ideological indicators, biographical details, and of course past election results. Those are the main categories, and what you’ve just read off was making some expectations on what those economic indicators and presidential approval will be later in the summer. But there’s really two main reasons to be making fundamental models like this. The first is that it does allow us to make fairly accurate predictions well ahead of the election, which is fun and interesting but also meaningful to those people involved in elections. And the second thing is that by making these fundamental models that take away polls and prediction markets, it lets us look and see how this fundamental data does correlate with election results. These are things that pundits knock back and forth on a regular basis, and here we can add a little bit of data and clarity to those discussions. Steven Cherry: You mentioned “fairly accurate”—I mean, you have some measure, right? You applied your model to other elections. David Rothschild: That’s correct. So this model in particular was calibrated based off the last 10 cycles. We’re looking at state-by-state elections, so we’re looking at 510 somewhat independent elections. Obviously there are national currents as well as idiosyncrasies between the states in any given election cycle, but especially for things like past election results you get to train it on a fairly large number of different elections, if you look at 10 cycles and the 51 different electoral college elections. And that’s what it’s based off of, but then we work to systematically drop data in order to continuously have an out-of-sample look at the data as well when we calibrate it. Steven Cherry: We should note what the margin of error is. David Rothschild: Sure. So what we’re looking at here—and the easiest way to think about it is, is that there’s a mean absolute error in the expected vote share—so the amount of the two-party vote share that either candidate will receive—it’s about three percentage points. Steve Cherry: And there are a lot of state results—I guess, actually about 15 of them, including some big ones—within that, right? David Rothschild: Sure. And in the way you read it off is fun, exciting, but if you look at the tables we provide, some of these states we’re giving a probability of victory within 40–60 percent, so there are at least three states here, Virginia, Ohio, and New Hampshire, which are within just a few percentage points of flipping over from one candidate to the other. Steven Cherry: And if somebody runs as a third-party candidate, a serious third party candidate—I mean, for example, if Ron Paul ran and might get 10 percent of the vote, that might throw everything out, right? David Rothschild: I wouldn’t say it would throw everything out. It is something that we’ve looked at. It’s something we forget, but there have been three serious third-party challengers in the last 11 cycles, I guess. We had Wallace in ’68 and Anderson in ’80 and Perot in kind of ’92 and ’96, so it is something that we’ve seen before, though it is hard to tell exactly at this stage which candidates it affected the most. But it is something that the data has seen before. Steven Cherry: Now your model does assume that Mitt Romney is Obama’s candidate [but] only for the purpose of picking the Republican candidate’s home state, I guess? David Rothschild: That’s correct. It doesn’t make very much of a difference in this model, and I think that’s one of the main interesting findings of this, is that, quite frankly, you can make a fairly accurate prediction pretty far away from the election and do it without even knowing the candidates. Now, this is not to say that the candidates and campaigns don’t make a difference; as you mentioned, probably well over a billion dollars will probably be spent by each side, so first of all we’re talking about the net effect of the campaign. So if one candidate spent over a billion dollars and the other candidate wasn’t able to equal that, you’re likely to see some major impact. So we’re talking about the net effect, and there’s also some error, and this error, a lot of it is idiosyncratic between the states in a given year. But still, these are things that are affected by the campaigns and candidates, and that’s really where you can think their impact is made.

### Elections Link – Spending Unpopular

#### Spending is unpopular with the public

Jeffrey M. Jones, Managing editor @ Gallup, 7-13-2011, “On Deficit, Americans Prefer Spending Cuts,” http://www.gallup.com/poll/148472/deficit-americans-prefer-spending-cuts-open-tax-hikes.aspx

Americans' preferences for deficit reduction clearly favor spending cuts to tax increases, but most Americans favor a mix of the two approaches. Twenty percent favor an approach that relies only on spending cuts and 4% favor an approach that uses tax increases alone. These results are based on a July 7-10 Gallup poll, conducted as government leaders from both parties continued negotiating an agreement to raise the federal debt limit. Both Republicans and Democrats appear willing to raise the debt limit, provided the government outlines plans to significantly reduce federal deficits in the future. The parties generally agree on making deep spending cuts, but do not agree on whether tax increases should be included to help reach their target goals for deficit reduction. Many Republicans in Congress oppose any such tax increases; thus, the legislation may not pass if tax hikes are included. Americans do not necessarily share this view, with 20% saying deficit reduction should come only through spending cuts. That percentage is a little higher, 26%, among those who identify as Republicans. Republicans do, however, tilt heavily in favor of reducing the deficit primarily if not exclusively with spending cuts (67%) as opposed to tax increases (3%). Fifty-one percent of independents share that preference. Democrats are most inclined to want equal amounts of spending cuts and tax increases (42%), though more favor a tilt toward spending cuts (33%) than tax increases (20%). Gallup finds about 6 in 10 Americans paying close attention to the debate about raising the debt limit. When the same poll asked for their general position on raising the limit, without providing reasons for doing so or not doing so, Americans were more likely to oppose an increase than favor one. The 42% who are opposed to doing so generally find fault with the government's spending patterns when asked in an open-ended format to explain their views. The most common reasons given for opposing an increased debt limit are that the U.S. already has too much debt and cannot afford more, that the government needs to control its spending, and that it needs to do a better job of budgeting and living within its means.

#### Public supports spending cuts, not increases

Jeffrey M. Jones, Managing editor @ Gallup, 7-13-2011, “On Deficit, Americans Prefer Spending Cuts,” http://www.gallup.com/poll/148472/deficit-americans-prefer-spending-cuts-open-tax-hikes.aspx

Government spending seems to be the primary worry for Americans when their opinions are probed about raising the debt limit. Government leaders appear to be listening, as party leaders are proposing major cuts in future government spending as a way to persuade members of Congress to vote for an increase in the nation's debt limit. In terms of deficit reduction, Americans seem to generally back an approach that relies more on spending cuts than tax increases. A key question to be answered in the days ahead is whether an agreement to raise the debt ceiling will include any tax increases. This is something many Republican members of Congress oppose, but most Americans do not seem to share this view.

#### Any new spending is unpopular with the public

Jeffrey M. Jones, ed. @ Gallup, 11-20-2010, “Americans Prioritize Deficit Reduction as an Economic Strategy," http://www.gallup.com/poll/144956/americans-prioritize-deficit-reduction-economic-strategy.aspx

Americans are most likely to choose deficit and debt reduction as the best approach for dealing with the economy over three widely discussed alternatives: raising taxes on the wealthy, cutting taxes, and increasing stimulus spending. These results are based on a USA Today/Gallup poll conducted Nov. 19-21 as the U.S. economy continues to suffer from sluggish growth and high unemployment. Americans do not show a strong consensus for any of the approaches, but clearly reject additional economic stimulus spending. The increased government spending in late 2008/early 2009 to bail out major U.S. corporations and attempt to jump-start the economy concerned many Americans and helped fuel the Tea Party movement, leading to significant Democratic losses in Congress in the midterm elections.

### Elections Link – Highway Funding Unpopular

#### Plan is unpopular with the Tea Party – they want the feds out of transportation

Joan Lowy, 2012, “Highway bill becomes House Republican headache,” Public Opinion, http://www.publicopiniononline.com/statenews/ci\_20238551/highway-bill-becomes-house-republican-headache

A bill that Republican leaders were promoting as the centerpiece of their job-creation agenda has instead turned into one of their biggest headaches, thanks largely to tea party conservatives who want to get the federal government out of transportation programs and hand them over to the states. The House and Senate are heading toward a showdown next week that could result in a cutoff of federal highway and transit aid to states just as the spring construction season starts. The government's authority to spend money from the trust fund that pays for transportation programs, as well as its power to levy the federal gasoline and diesel taxes that feed the fund, expire on March 31. Democrats estimate as many as 1.8 million jobs supported by those programs are at risk. Neither side wants a shutdown, but House Speaker John Boehner has been unable to recruit enough Republicans to pass the GOP's overhaul of federal highway programs. The biggest group of holdouts are conservatives who want highway programs to be paid for entirely by federal gas and diesel taxes even though that might mean a nearly 40 percent cut in spending because revenue from those taxes has declined.

#### The public doesn’t even use the public transit that exists now

Wall Street Journal, 4-15-2012, “Why Your Highway Has Potholes,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303815404577333631864470566.html

Since 1982 government mass-transit subsidies have totaled $750 billion (in today's dollars), yet the share of travelers using transit has fallen by nearly one-third, according to Heritage Foundation transportation expert Wendell Cox. Federal data indicate that in 2010 in most major cities more people walked to work or telecommuted than used public transit. Brookings Institution economist Cliff Winston finds that "the cost of building rail systems is notorious for exceeding expectations, while ridership levels tend to be much lower than anticipated." He calculates that the only major U.S. rail system in which the benefits outweigh the government subsidies is San Francisco's BART, and no others are close to break-even.

#### Highway funding sparks controversy with liberals who hate cars and rural states who don’t want to pay

Wall Street Journal, 4-15-2012, “Why Your Highway Has Potholes,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303815404577333631864470566.html

One reason roads are shortchanged is that liberals believe too many Americans drive cars. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has been pushing a strange "livability" agenda, which he defines as "being able to take your kids to school, go to work, see a doctor, drop by the grocery or post office, go out to dinner and a movie, and play with your kids in a park, all without having to get in your car." This is the mind of the central planner at work, imagining that Americans all want to live in his little utopia. The current scheme also creates giant inequities. Politically powerful cities get a big chunk of the money, while many Western and Southern states get less back than they pay in. But why should people in Akron, Ohio or Casper, Wyoming have to pay gas taxes to finance the New York subway or light rail in Denver? One reason there is so much overspending on inefficient urban transit is that federal matching dollars require residents in other states to foot up to half the bill.

### Elections Link – High Speed Rail Unpopular

#### High speed rail projects are unpopular

Will Oremus, 12-7-2011, “Requiem for a Train,” Slate, http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\_speed\_rail\_is\_dead\_in\_america\_should\_we\_mourn\_it\_.html

There was a brief burst of enthusiasm around the future of high-speed rail in January 2010, when President Obama announced $8 billion in federal stimulus spending to start building “America’s first nationwide program of high-speed intercity passenger rail service.” Since then, however, the project’s chances of success have been heading in one direction: downhill. First, Tea Party conservatives in Florida and wealthy liberal suburbanites in the Bay Area began questioning their states’ plans. Then, just as Joe Biden was calling for $53 billion in high-speed-rail spending over the next six years, a crop of freshly elected Republican governors turned down billions in federal money for lines in Wisconsin, Ohio, and Florida. Finally, Republicans in Congress zeroed out the federal high-speed rail budget last month. (To understand why conservatives hate trains, see my colleague Dave Weigel’s story from earlier this year.)

#### Even supporters have abandoned HSR

Will Oremus, 12-7-2011, “Requiem for a Train,” Slate, http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\_speed\_rail\_is\_dead\_in\_america\_should\_we\_mourn\_it\_.html

The project was oversold from the beginning, with projections of 100 million riders per year and healthy operating profits—yes, profits, on a railroad—leading to skepticism even among those inclined to support it. Along with the usual conservative opponents, the wealthy liberals living along the railroad’s proposed path in Palo Alto and neighboring cities—sufficiently motivated by the prospect of trains roaring literally through their backyards—began to uncover holes in the financing scheme as well. Rather than take them seriously, the rail line’s bullheaded backers attempted to steamroll the opposition, branding them NIMBYs and “rotten apples.” Sure, they were NIMBYs, but it didn’t make them wrong. And when they leveraged their connections and media savvy to get state lawmakers, academics, and journalists like me to investigate, the findings that came back damaged the project’s credibility. Under pressure to come up with more realistic projections, state rail authorities admitted last month that the project would take twice as long to build as they’d originally claimed, attract fewer riders, and cost twice as much. The honesty was welcome, but it came too late: A poll released this week showed the public has turned against high-speed rail altogether, with nearly two-thirds saying they’d like a chance to reconsider.

#### Turn shield – HSR critics are louder than supporters

Will Oremus, 12-7-2011, “Requiem for a Train,” Slate, http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/technocracy/2011/12/high\_speed\_rail\_is\_dead\_in\_america\_should\_we\_mourn\_it\_.html

Ultimately, high-speed rail’s backers weren’t as staunch as its detractors. Barack Obama and congressional Democrats put their political lives on the line for health care, addressing an immediate problem whose consequences were personal and visceral. The nation’s outdated infrastructure is a major dilemma but one that doesn’t feel as pressing to most voters and legislators. It’s our children’s problem now.

### Elections Link – Space Transportation Unpopular

#### Even if the public supports space, they don’t want to fund it

Jeremy Hsu, 1-13-2011, “The Myth of America’s Love Affair with the Moon,” Space.Com, http://www.space.com/10601-apollo-moon-program-public-support-myth.html

The good news for space exploration in general is that public opinion favors it – but only when not taking economic costs and budgetary spending into consideration. "When you divorce it from the numbers and you ask people if they like NASA and spaceflight, people say yes," Launius told SPACE.com. "75 to 80 percent are in favor." The space historian examined nationally representative polls done by industry people and Gallup that asked the same consistent questions year after year. He also looked at polls conducted by the New York Times and others. Public support for overall space funding has hovered around 80 percent in favor of the status quo since 1965, except for a major dip in support during the early 1970s. That may bode well for NASA's continued existence, but it also suggests that few people are clamoring to throw even more money at the space agency.

#### Public massively overestimates the size of the NASA budget – don’t want to add to it

Jeremy Hsu, 1-13-2011, “The Myth of America’s Love Affair with the Moon,” Space.Com, http://www.space.com/10601-apollo-moon-program-public-support-myth.html

Still, polls also show a huge misconception regarding the cost of the U.S. space program. Public opinion has wrongly put NASA's budget at about 22 percent of the government's spending over the years, when in fact NASA's budget only reached 4.3 percent of the federal budget at its peak in 1965. Since the 1970s, the U.S. space agency's budget has hovered below 1 percent of government spending. "My suggestion is that NASA is so visible and the space shuttle is such a powerful icon that people believe this stuff must cost an enormous amount of money," Launius said. As for 2010, NASA's budget came in at just six-tenths of 1 percent of all government spending. Neither side of the political aisle seems to have any real interest in boosting NASA's budget, according to Launius.

#### Public doesn’t like space projects

Rasmussen Reports, 1-15-2010, “59% Favor Cutting Back on Space Exploration”, http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\_content/lifestyle/general\_lifestyle/january\_2010/50\_favor\_cutting\_back\_on\_space\_exploration

Fifty percent (50%) of Americans now say the United States should cut back on space exploration given the current state of the economy, according to a new Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey.Just 31% disagree with cutting the space program, and 19% more are not sure. The new findings mark a six-point increase in support - from 44% last July - for cutting back on space exploration. Still, Americans are almost evenly divided when asked if the space program should be funded by the government or by the private sector. Thirty-five percent (35%) believe the government should pay for space research, while 38% think private interests should pick up the tab. Twenty-six percent (26%) aren’t sure which is best. (Want a free daily e-mail update ? If it's in the news, it's in our polls). Rasmussen Reports updates are also available on Twitter or Facebook. Sixty-four percent (64%) of adults have at least a somewhat favorable view of NASA, including 18% with a very favorable opinion of the government’s chief space agency. Just 20% have a somewhat or very unfavorable opinion of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2008. But that marks a sizable drop in support for NASA from a survey last May. At that time, 81% had a favorable view of NASA, including 24% with a very favorable opinion. The May findings, however, were a 23-point rebound for the space agency from July 2007 when just 58% had a favorable opinion.

### Florida Key To Election

#### FL key – high electoral vote count

The Washington Independent, 2-3-2011, “2012 GOP prospects frequent prized swing state Florida,” http://washingtonindependent.com/105346/2012-gop-prospects-frequent-prized-swing-state-florida

With its high number of votes in the electoral college, Florida has long been one of the nation’s most important swing states, and a vital battleground in presidential elections. Often noted for its nail-bitingly close elections, Florida’s choice for president is generally a fair indication of the election’s overall winner. In fact, the state has voted with the winning candidate in nine out of the past 10 election cycles. #

#### FL Key

Linda Feldmann, staff writer, 12-18-2011, “2012 presidential election: Florida could decide it all,” CSM, http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/2012-presidential-election-florida-could-decide-it-all?page=0,3

Welcome to the biggest, most diverse battleground state in presidential politics, where every demographic group and, lest we forget, every vote matters. It's been 11 years since the days of "hanging chads" and Bush versus Gore, when the Republican governor of Texas and the Democratic vice president came closer to an exact tie in the final deciding state than anyone dreamed possible. In 2012, Florida will be a more valuable prize than ever. This time, 29 electoral votes are at stake, up from 25 in 2000, of the 270 needed for victory. For the Republican nominee, Florida is a must-win – thus the choice of Tampa for the GOP convention next August. For Obama, winning without Florida will be difficult but doable. He has electoral votes to burn from the 365 he won in '08.

#### FL and PA are key – Obama can’t swing Midwest but still wins if he controls those 2 states

Nick Ottens, staff writer, 11-8-2011, “Obama’s Swing State Challenge,” Atlantic Senitinel, http://atlanticsentinel.com/2011/11/obamas-swing-state-challenge/

The 2012 presidential election will be decided in twelve battleground states. As Barack Obama is unpopular among white working class voters, his ability to sway the Rust Belt will be limited, imperiling his reelection prospects. A plurality of voters now consider themselves independent. One out of four believe that the country is “on the wrong track.” Less than half approve of the president’s job performance. These are tough numbers faces an incumbent who is fighting for reelection. Americans are apparently less and less confident in President Obama’s ability to lead them out of recession. But his most structural challenge may be demographic. As David Gregory, moderator of Meet the Press, pointed out on NBC’s Hardball last week, the Democrats “don’t just have to win” the Latino vote in the southwest, “they have to win them huge.” Although the party traditionally polls well among racial minorities, Republicans realize that if they are to attain a majority in states like Colorado, Nevada and New Mexico, they have to appeal to the same Hispanic voting bloc that tends to be more socially conservative than Asian or black Americans. In the upper Midwest, added Gregory, Obama’s has to appeal to blue collar, typically unionized voters whose economic prospects haven’t improved under his presidency. Especially with regard to environmental issues, where the activist left and unions collide, Obama is in a tough spot. If he reins in the Environmental Protection Agency, he risks alienating greens whereas not enough of a focus on job creation could disappoint working class voters. Kimberley Strassel wrote in The Wall Street Journal that blue collar white voters can still play a decisive role despite the emphasis on minorities in the press. They helped Hillary Clinton beat Barack Obama in Pennsylvania and Ohio during the 2008 Democratic Party primary elections. “Obama would go on in the general election to lock up the college educated, the affluent, the women, the minorities, the first time voters—you name it.” But he lost the white working class by eighteen points. Rather than court this constituency, the Obama Administration has spent three years waging war on it with activist environmental legislation that’s especially hurt the decaying industrial base of the northwest. A Pew poll this year found an astonishing 43 percent of the white working class didn’t believe they’d be better off in ten years—the most negative views of any group polled, by far. It helps explain why, in the 2010 election, the white working class surged to give the GOP a record 63 percent of their vote, 30 points more than for Democrats. White blue collar voters make up 40 percent of the electorate nationwide and they form an even bigger group in many of the very swing states Obama needs to win. In 2008, the president won 359 electoral votes, including a lone elector in the state of Nebraska. Even if he loses Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin, where the impact of the recession has been severest, but wins the west, he would still have the 270 votes needed to win exactly. If he also lost his one vote from Nebraska, the race would be tied. The two states that the president cannot afford to lose are Florida and Pennsylvania. The former was won by George W. Bush in both 2000 and 2004 while the latter went for the Democratic candidate in those elections. Each time, the margins of victory were slim in both states and they trended Republican during the congressional midterms of 2010. Between them, Florida and Pennsylvania wield forty-nine electoral votes.

### Obama Good – Turns Case – Heg/Econ

#### Romney kills our alliance structure – ends heg

David Solimini, the Communications Director for the Truman National Security Project, 9-30-2011, “Mitt Romney Throws America’s Allies Under Bus for Political Gain,” The Moderate Voice, http://themoderatevoice.com/124153/mitt-romney-throws-americas-allies-under-bus-for-political-gain/

This week, Mitt Romney clumsily waded into the discussion of Israel and Palestine. By calling for a wholesale re-evaluation of relations with dozens of countries, he called more than his own judgment into question. Strong alliances are an essential element of American power. They are difficult to build, important to maintain, and essential in a world of inter-connected economies and cross-border security threats. It is in this essential context that leading conservative voices have engaged in a perilous race to the bottom on issues of American national security. Most recently, former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romneyz suggested that the United States reconsider a number of long-standing alliances purely to further domestic political considerations. On Tuesday, right-wing radio show host Jordan Sekulowz asked Romney how he would handle the application by Palestine for statehood recognition by the UN if he were president. Romney responded: Putting aside what’s already happened, at this stage the president should make it very clear that we stand with Israel, that this is very important to the United States of America and that any nation that votes against Israel and against the United States in the vote in the United Nations will recognize that America will very carefully reconsider our relationship with that nation. Defenders of Romney’s position might say it was an important statement in support of Israel. Critics would note that there are far better ways to demonstrate support for an independent Jewish state free from terrorism – a position he shares with President Obamaz. Romney went farther than he needed to go, apparently in an attempt to place political distance between himself and the president. Had the words he uttered – “America will very carefully reconsider our relationship with that nation” – actually come from the mouth of a sitting president, the impact would have been significant. The former governor’s answer to a straightforward question is revealing to the point where one might wonder if Romney realizes the enormity of the job he seeks. These are not quarterly earnings reports or 10K filings, these are nations – some of which have nuclear weapons and thousands of our troops stationed in them. Let us consider exactly what Romney suggested: Romney would be open to re-analyzing our relationships with China, the world’s most populous nation; Russia, the nation with the most nuclear weapons in the world; India, the world’s largest democracy; and Brazil and South Africa, two of the world’s largest developing nations. Our relationship with Russia is essential to the prevention of a second Cold War. India is America’s best bulwark against China in the East and Pakistan to the North. Also among those who would fall afoul of Romney’s domestic political concerns include Spain, France, Norway, and Ireland, some of America’s longest held friendships. If a president were to say what would-be-President Romney said, we would be forced to ask what it means to “reconsider” these relationships. Would a President Romney take the same actions in re-evaluating our relationship with China, our largest trading partner, as he would with Ireland? Would a President Romney cut funding to the efforts to stabilize Iraq over its vote on Palestinian statehood? Would he pull out of the 2016 Olympic Games because of Brazil’s statement of support, or shut down the $160 billion per year in American goods sold to countries supporting the UN resolution? And what of our ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan? Would we stop the rebuilding efforts essential to peace in Iraq over this issue, even if it meant stretching out our military presence there? Governor Romney’s willingness to use our international alliances for political gain will likely be seen by many as deeply troubling. America’s interests are clearly served by a stable solution to the conflicts in the Middle East, and Israel is a valuable if sometimes imperfect ally. It’s also in our interests for ostensibly credible candidates not to make inflammatory policy proclamations for political gain. Romney’s comments cannot be taken in isolation. It is possible, and perhaps even likely, that he is exercising the political triangulation he is famous for and is simply catching up with some of the clumsier comments of his peers on the campaign trail. Michele Bachmannz, for example, believes the Arab Spring is a problem for which she must assign the blame to President Obama. It is a familiar and troubling playbook from the ex-governor. Keeping America safe requires that we exercise delicate diplomacy backed by the effective and powerful force of our military. We have seen both exercised with deftness under President Obama, with relationships improving between us and our allies and precisely targeted strikes taking out more of our enemies than the Bush Administration managed to accomplish. America is not well-served when the talk is tough but the strategic considerations are ignored.

### Obama Good – Turns Case – Heg/Econ

#### GOP win causes financial crises

Nichael Konczal, fellow at the Roosevelt Institute, January/February 2012, “Financial Regulation,” Washington Monthly, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january\_february\_2012/features/financial\_regulation034477.php?page=2

Going forward, the Republicans’ intentions with respect to Dodd-Frank are already clear: in Congress, they have introduced repeal legislation, and every major Republican presidential candidate has pledged to repeal Dodd- Frank in its entirety. It’s fair to take them at their word. Even if a Republican majority set out to kill the bill in one fell swoop but was blocked by a Democratic filibuster, it wouldn’t really matter. That’s because there are a series of simple steps Republicans can take to pull apart Dodd- Frank piece by piece. The collective effect would be similar to that of an overall repeal and would leave the global financial system in serious peril. Why does the GOP view Dodd-Frank as an unnecessary overreach? In their minds, there’s no problem to solve where the financial system is concerned. While the vast majority of economists and financial experts view the 2008 collapse of the banking sector, and the ensuing Great Recession, as the result of decades of unrestrained, unregulated experimentation by Wall Street firms, the right rejects this view. Conservatives see the crash as a cautionary tale about government intervention in the housing markets, in which the subprime mortgage boom was egged on by community organizers and government-sponsored enterprises like Fannie Mae. That George W. Bush was one of the biggest backers of “the ownership society” and that the much-maligned community activists were actually shouting early warnings about problems in the housing market are inconvenient facts to be ignored. As if suffering from a form of ideological color blindness, wherever there are large market failures in the current infrastructure of our financial system, conservatives can’t see the problems themselves, only the presence of the government. It has long been the case that, in the conservative imagination, the best market is one with the least amount of rules. In the 1990s, Senator Phil Gramm infamously told SEC Chair Arthur Levitt that “unless the waters are crimson with the blood of investors, I don’t want you embarking on any regulatory flights of fancy.” This guiding principle led many at Alan Greenspan’s Federal Reserve to ignore signs of fraud in subprime lending early on, despite the warnings. At the same time, there was a very conscious effort to tie state regulators in knots whenever possible, mostly by overruling, or “preempting,” state laws on behalf of large national banks. And in the years since the crisis, even without controlling the White House and the Senate, Republicans have managed to block key presidential appointments, tighten budgets, and harass regulators at every turn. All of these strategies— softening federal oversight, hampering regulatory institutions, and interfering in any state-level attempts to provide tough oversight of the financial industry—would surely be reprised by a Republican White House and Congress in each of the major battlegrounds on financial reform. Take the issue of consumer protection. The root cause of the financial crisis was an abusive, predatory, unregulated lending market that drove lots of bad mortgages to unknowing consumers as well as investors. Though most regulatory agencies list consumer protection among their goals, no regulator was dedicated explicitly to the task until Dodd- Frank mandated the creation of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Reformers were careful to structure the CFPB for maximum clout and independence. It has a single director, and its budget, a guaranteed appropriation from the Federal Reserve, cannot be cut by Congress. These features are exactly what the GOP wants to dismantle. Senate Republicans have signed a letter declaring that they’ll oppose any candidate for director of the CFPB unless the bureau is subjected to the congressional appropriation process, allowing the next aspiring Phil Gramm to slash its budget at first chance. They also want to replace the director with a board and muddle the mission of the bureau away from its consumer focus. All these moves will lead to gridlock, creating a much weaker CFPB. Republicans would also like to undo the components of Dodd-Frank that force hitherto unregulated, “over the counter” derivative trading into open exchanges that are transparent and well regulated. During the decade leading up to the financial crash, derivatives, once mainly used by companies to hedge risk on commodities with fluctuating prices (e.g., oil for airlines), were seized upon by Wall Street, and the size of this potentially explosive market skyrocketed. By 2003, Warren Buffet was calling derivatives “financial weapons of mass destruction.” When the markets crashed in 2008, derivatives transactions had gotten so large yet so murky that it was nearly impossible to know who was on the hook for the tremendous losses. In an attempt to prevent a repeat of these circumstances, Dodd-Frank requires derivatives trading to take place in public exchanges, and obliges firms to put up enough collateral to ensure that, if their bets go bad, they can pay back investors (unlike AIG, which required billions of taxpayer funds to do so). During negotiations over the law, there was a big fight over what kinds of derivatives would be exempted from these rules. There was also a battle over which kinds of nonfinancial firms, “end users” like airlines and industry, would be exempt. Republicans will try to expand these end user exemptions and narrow the types of derivatives that have to follow the new rules laid out in Dodd-Frank, bringing us closer to the pre-crisis status quo. There’s already movement in the House to try to rewrite the parts of Dodd-Frank dealing with price transparency in derivatives trading so that less information has to be disclosed. A third aspect of Dodd-Frank that the GOP has in its crosshairs is the law’s effort to deal with the “too big to fail” problem. In the wake of the financial crisis, many economists argued that the best and perhaps only way to avoid the need for massive bailouts in the future would be to cut the nation’s biggest financial institutions down to size, such that the failure of any one would not drag down the entire financial system. That’s not the course the Obama administration and congressional Democrats took. Instead, with Dodd-Frank, they placed a special set of regulations on the largest and most complicated financial firms, known as “systemically important financial institutions” firms—companies like Goldman Sachs and Citigroup. Under the law, these behemoths are required to hold more capital in reserve than they did before the crisis, and must prepare “living wills” so the government can take control of them if they do fail, cushioning the impact on the rest of the economy. When Barney Frank bragged that there “will be death panels enacted by this Congress, but they will be for nonbank financial institutions,” he was referring to this living-will provision and the government’s new authority to take over these institutions in the event of their failure. Several of the firms would also likely fall under the Volcker Rule, which bans firms with FDIC protection from outright gambling with a taxpayer backstop and secretly betting against the interests of their own clients. Needless to say, the banks would be glad not to have to deal with any of these new rules. Beyond these three main areas of regulation, virtually all the other reforms in Dodd-Frank would be at risk from Republican efforts to stop regulators from writing the necessary rules and implementing them in the marketplace. Funding for the agencies will be important here; House Republicans have already attempted to radically cut the budget of the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Nor will GOP attacks on financial regulation be limited to Dodd- Frank. Most of the major presidential candidates have stated that they intend to repeal Sarbanes-Oxley, the financial reporting mandate put into place after the corporate scandals at Enron and WorldCom. If laws like Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank are repealed or eviscerated in the ways Republicans have explicitly called for—or have at least hinted at—it is not hard to imagine the possible consequences. The largest firms would be dangerously risky, continuing to exert way too much influence over the markets and to keep finding new, innovative ways to gamble with other people’s money. Reforms that would limit abusive practices across the market won’t be put into place. The financial markets will be set up to generate maximum panic and confusion in a crisis. When the next set of problems starts to occur in the financial market, we’ll be in no better shape to deal with the crisis than we were before. Financial firms are constantly creating new, complex products and services that could pose risks to the entire financial system but are little understood by regulators. Unless agencies are given the funding and mandate to keep up with Wall Street’s innovations, it will be difficult if not impossible to stop the next crisis at an early stage.

### Obama Good – Russia Relations 2NC

#### Reset is working – Obama can constrain Russia-bashing – GOP win kills cooperation

Fred Weir, staff writer, 10-26-2011, “Putin and the 'Russian Empire': Can U.S.-Russian relations survive?” CSM, http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/putin-and-russian-empire-can-us-russian-relations-survive?page=0,1

Russia's foreign policy community is watching with growing nervousness as leading Republicans in the US, including at least one top contender for the party's presidential nomination, turn their ire against Barack Obama's already troubled "reset" in US-Russian relations, which the Kremlin sees as vital to its future plans for repairing Russian influence in the world. Republicans have been critical all along of Mr. Obama's policy of building strong, practical relations with Moscow while soft-peddling US disapproval of Kremlin power abuses and human rights violations. But as recently as last December, more than a dozen Republican senators joined Democrats to win the needed two-thirds Senate ratification of the START nuclear arms reduction accord, which was understood in Moscow as a sign that pragmatism would always prevail in Washington. Now, Russian experts do not seem so sure. Since former president Vladimir Putin decided to shoulder aside his hand-picked successor, Dmitry Medvedev, and seek a fresh term as Russia's supreme leader, the tone of discussion about Russia in the US has grown much harsher, many note. Mr. Putin's recently publicized plan to establish a "Eurasian Union" – a strong economic, and potentially political, alliance of former Soviet states – has rekindled fears among many in the West that Russia's strategic goal is to bring back the USSR and return to its historic rivalry with the US. "We had hoped that the reset with the US might help Russia move into a friendlier, closer relationship with the West, but that seems to be fading fast," says Viktor Kremeniuk, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Now it seems the general opinion in the US is that Russia is fast becoming an authoritarian state with the scarecrow figure of Putin as its next president. It's all starting to feel a bit hopeless." In a Washington Post interview earlier this month, Republican presidential contender Mitt Romney, often seen as moderate, is quoted as saying that Putin "dreams of rebuilding the Russian empire." Obama's reset of relations "has to end ... we have to show strength," Mr. Romney added. Reining in Russian ambitions? At a Washington conference Tuesday, Republican House Speaker John Boehner slammed Russia's "use of old tools and old thinking" as an attempt "to restore Soviet-style power and influence," and called for tougher measures to rein in Russian ambitions. At the same meeting, Garry Kasparov, a leader of the banned Other Russia opposition movement, urged Americans to heed Ronald Reagan's advice and treat Putin's Russia as an "evil empire" beyond the pale of civilized nations. The current cold war-style spat between Moscow and Washington over the suspicious death of Sergei Magnitsky, an anticorruption lawyer who died after being denied medical treatment in a Russian remand prison two years ago, clearly illustrates the reasons Moscow prefers Obama to any Republican who might come into the White House. A bill currently before the US Senate, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, and heavily supported by Republicans, would impose tough visa restrictions and financial penalties on a list of Russian officials deemed to be implicated in his fate. But the US State Department has moved to preempt the bill by issuing its own "secret" list of proscribed officials, without imposing any financial sanctions, and connecting it with global human rights policies rather than a measure specifically targeted at Russia. Last weekend Moscow announced its own list of US citizens allegedly implicated in human rights abuses, who would be denied entry to Russia. "On the surface it looks like a bad dispute, but actually we see the actions of the Obama administration as proof that it is committed to the reset," says Dmitry Suslov, an expert with the Council on Foreign and Defense Policies, an influential Moscow think tank. "The Senate bill is purely anti-Russian, and for the time being at least, Obama has managed to blunt this. It's greatly appreciated in Moscow.... We know that if any of the current Republican presidential nominees makes it to the White House, things will go very badly for the US-Russian relationship." Apprehensions that Putin is an anti-Western hardliner who will reverse the more liberal foreign policies of Mr. Medvedev are greatly exaggerated, he adds. "Putin was involved with the reset from the very beginning. In fact, it would be weird to think that any major policy could have been developed in Moscow over the past four years without his leadership," Mr. Suslov says. "And Putin is not, by nature, an anti-Western ideologue. He understands the benefits of maintaining good relations with the US. Whatever happens in Washington, what you will see on the Russian side in the coming years under Putin is mostly continuity," he adds. The reset has delivered Russian analysts argue that the reset has so far delivered quite a few benefits, and if the next US president abandons it the world will become a more dangerous place. Besides the START deal, which slashed nuclear arsenals on both sides and installed a system for mutual verification, they point to greatly improved Russian cooperation in pressuring Iran to give up its alleged nuclear weapons program. A Russian-approved "northern corridor" through former Soviet territory is now used to deliver almost half of all supplies reaching embattled NATO forces in Afghanistan, and stepped up anti-drug collaboration between Moscow and the US may finally be making a dent in the flow of narcotics from Afghanistan to the West via pipelines through former Soviet territory, experts say.

### Obama Good – Russia Relations 2NC

#### Nuke war and every global problem

Graham Allison, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School and a former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, 10-30-2011, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1011/67178.html

House Speaker John Boehner recently delivered a fiery indictment of Russia and the Obama administration’s entire “reset” in Russian policy. From the vantage point of two longtime Russia watchers — one a Republican who served in the George W. Bush administration and the other a Democrat who served in the Pentagon under President Bill Clinton — Boehner misses the point. That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

### Obama Good – US-Russia Relations

#### Obama loss ends the reset – kills Medvedevs rapprochement

Eugene Ivanov, political commentator, 10-10-2011, “Resetting Putin,” Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/10/10/resetting\_putin\_13554.html

And then, in November, the presidential election in the United States will take place. Obama has about a 50-50 chance of losing it, and should this happen, the agenda and the dynamics of the Washington-Moscow dialogue for the foreseeable future will be defined not by Putin, but by the next U.S. president, a Republican. Incidentally, Mitt Romney, currently the leading Republican presidential candidate — and, therefore, the likeliest “new partner” for Putin – remarked recently that the “reset” in U.S.-Russia relations “has to end.” Of course, Obama may still get re-elected, but his ability to conduct the Russia policy he wants will be further limited by the expected loss of the Democratic majority in the Senate, something that the apologists of the “nothing-is-going-to change” approach seem to overlook. It is no secret that Obama invested heavily in his relationship with Medvedev – on the assumption that supporting Medvedev was a way to signal U.S. support for reforms in Russia and, of course, on the assumption that supporting Medvedev will improve his chances to be elected for the second term. Now, having been proven wrong, Obama will feel utterly uncomfortable in his communications with Putin. Making things even worse, Senate Republicans – most likely, in majority – will obstruct his every move vis-à-vis Russia, however benign. In 2008, Henry Kissinger perceptively observed that when Putin was president, “Russian policy … [was] … driven in a quest for a reliable strategic partner, with America being the preferred choice.” Regardless of whether Putin “trusts” or “mistrusts” the West, he has all the reasons to believe that his offer of strategic partnership to the United States had been rejected by anti-Russian policies of the Bush administration. What has Putin heard so far from the other side of the Atlantic that persuaded him that the U.S. now considers him a “new partner?” That he is not supposed to change Russia’s U.S. policy? Naturally, any speculations on the direction of Russian foreign policy during Putin’s third and, possibly, fourth presidential term are premature, yet the very notion that nothing will change because Medvedev’s past initiatives were implicitly or explicitly supported by Putin – which is impossible to know for sure – appears dangerously naïve. After all, Putin’s acquiescing to Medvedev’s decisions – or choosing not to veto them – doesn’t prove his endorsement of these decisions, much less a willingness to pursue them. If American presidents regularly throw away foreign policy initiatives of their predecessors, why should Putin not feel free to do the same?

#### Romney kills START which kills relations

Timothy Westmyer, MA Candidate at Georgetown, 11-22-2011, “Swing and Miss: Mitt Romney and New START,” Democracy Arsenal, http://www.democracyarsenal.org/2011/11/swing-and-miss-mitt-romney-and-new-start.html

Mitt Romney’s foreign policy message centers on his promise to “never, ever apologize.” That is unfortunate, because he owes the American public an apology for his false predictions on New START. The former Massachusetts governor took to The Wall Street Journal’s opinion page earlier this month to recycle complaints about New START he first aired in a July 2010 op-ed Fred Kaplan called the most “shabby,” “misleading,” and “thoroughly ignorant” editorial he has read in 35 years. Today, we can add one more modifier to that list: proven wrong. New START entered into force on February 5, 2011 and is already a success. Rose Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, called the treaty a “bright spot in the U.S.-Russian relationship.” Russian cooperation with tougher sanctions on Iran and North Korea, overland transportation routes to Afghanistan, and cancelling the sale of advanced air defense systems to Iran are just some of the national security benefits made possible by the “reset” in U.S.-Russian relations. The U.S. military would beg to differ with Governor Romney’s view that President Obama got “virtually nothing in return” for New START. On-site inspections and data exchanges to verify New START have already begun. The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, testified in favor of prompt ratification to restore the ability to monitor the Russian arsenal that was lost with the expiration of START I. A detailed picture of the Russian strategic force has since emerged – including viewing the new Russian RS-24 missile – which lets U.S. defense planners develop plans and budgets with a more accurate threat assessment. New START placed no major limitation on U.S. missile defense plans. Romney wrote that the treaty’s preamble was proof that Russian negotiators shackled U.S. flexibility on missile defense. The preamble merely highlights an obvious link between offensive and defense weapon systems. Even if Romney’s reading was correct, a treaty’s preamble is nonbinding. It has about as much legal obligation as a fortune cookie. The Obama administration is going full steam ahead with the Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense in Europe. Initial tests in September successfully demonstrated that the infrastructure would be able to defend America’s allies in Europe from ballistic missile threats in the Middle East. Spain recently joined the Netherlands, Romania, Turkey and Poland as hosts for key elements of the system. This momentum should put to rest any concerns about restrained U.S. flexibility. Romney speculated that New START’s Bilateral Consultative Commission would use its “broad latitude to amend the treaty with specific references to missile defense.” Unsurprisingly there were no end-runs on missile defense at the commission’s inaugural meeting this spring. On the contrary, Gottemoeller suggests that the Treaty’s implementation has been a “pragmatic, business-like and positive” experience for all parties. The Russians are wary of future U.S. missile defense plans, but the Obama administration has initiated a dialogue over their concerns. Undersecretary of State Ellen Tauscher visited Moscow earlier this month to reassure Russia that the system is not directed at the Russian nuclear deterrent. The missile defense system, Tauscher said, “would only chase the tail of a Russian ICBM or SLBM.” The new bipartisan consensus that nuclear weapons play a shrinking role in defense puts Governor Romney outside the foreign policy mainstream. In a 2007 op-ed by George Shultz, Henry Kissinger, William Perry and Sam Nunn, these statesmen encourage leaders to eliminate Cold War era nuclear arsenals and prioritize efforts to keep nuclear material out of the hands of terrorists. In a major foreign policy speech he delivered last month, Romney remarkably overlooked the threat of nuclear terrorism. The next president must not turn the “reset” in U.S-Russian relations into a “relapse.” In a White Paper released last month, Romney doubled down on his mistaken predictions and promised, as president, to “review the implementation of New START” to “determine whether [it serves] the best interests and security of the United States.” Abandoning New START and future reductions would only encourage Russia to build new weapons, decreasing American security.

### Obama Good – China 2NC

#### Obama loss causes China war

Michael Swaine, Phd Harvard, specializes in Chinese security and foreign policy, U.S.–China relations, and East Asian international relations, one of the most prominent U.S. analysts in Chinese security studies, senior political scientist in international studies and also research director of the RAND Center for Asia-Pacific Policy, & Raymond Lu, lead author in this Asia Security Dispatch, 3-6-2012, “Mitt Romney’s Bleak China View”, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/2012/03/06/romney-s-china-policy-strategic-questions-still-unanswered/a0rl

During the recent visit of Chinese heir apparent Xi Jinping to the United States, Mitt Romney lambasted the Obama administration for approaching Beijing as a “near supplicant” and permitting “the dawn of a Chinese century” to continue unopposed. The way forward: tougher economic penalties to reverse Washington’s “trade surrender,” and an invigorated military presence in the Pacific to force China to abandon its dreams of regional hegemony. The conventional reading of Romney on China suggests that such chest-thumping rhetoric will fade with the election, giving way to the mainstream consensus that pairs economic and diplomatic engagement with strategic hedging. Though this is at least partially true, leaving the next administration’s China policy to the learning curve is still risky. Romney’s tough talk on China conceals some profoundly deterministic – and pessimistic assumptions – about the future of U.S.-China relations that could accelerate existing momentum for future confrontations. Without a critical appraisal of U.S. interests and capabilities, Romney could do both too much and too little to manage the frictions generated by an increasingly assertive China in Asia. Too much in that an overly aggressive and militarized response against China could set the two great powers on a collision course, and too little in that poorly-conceived interventions in other regions could force the United States to divert its attention and resources away from Asia, sending disturbing messages to China and U.S. allies alike. It would be tempting to dismiss Romney’s broadsides against the Obama administration’s China policy as red meat for the electorate. But the obligatory notes about currency manipulation mask a coherent, if troubling narrative of the future U.S.-China relationship, most likely authored by neoconservative advisors on the Romney team. When Romney warns that “a China that is a prosperous tyranny will increasingly pose problems for us, for its neighbors, and for the entire world,” he appears to be channeling the neoconservative school of thought that sees China’s Leninist, one-party regime as an insurmountable obstacle to strategic trust that will inevitably drive the two powers to clash. Robert Kagan and Aaron Friedberg, prominent members of his foreign policy team, have argued that an authoritarian political system distorts China’s strategic calculus, so that it sees the United States and its democratic allies as co-conspirators in an effort to throttle the nation’s growth. Given such deep-rooted beliefs, according to this view, China will have little choice but to overthrow the U.S.-led alliance system in Asia, and reconstitute a sphere of influence on its maritime periphery. As for the appropriate response to this alleged provocation, Romney largely echoes his advisors. Only by pouring more resources into a military buildup can the United States steer China away from “the path to regional hegemony” and toward the course of a responsible stakeholder. Expectations of a “contest for supremacy” in the Pacific may have driven Romney to promise to expand the U.S. navy by fifteen ships per year, compared with the current nine. Not all of Romney’s advisors offer such dire predictions about the future of U.S.-China relations, though the images and assumptions of neoconservatives have featured most prominently in his statements to date. Even the most hawkish of Romney’s advisors have no desire to revisit the horrors of Iraq in the Pacific. Rather, they believe that only a highly militarized response can compel a rising China to yield to the reality of U.S. predominance in the region. The aim is to extend the relatively peaceful status quo – with its broadly favorable terms for the United States, such as the ability to conduct unfettered surveillance along China’s eastern seaboard – into perpetuity.

### Obama Good – China 2NC

#### Extinction

Straits Times (Singapore), June 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable.Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.

### Obama Good – US-China Relations

#### GOP win in 2012 kills Sino-US relations and causes trade war

Fei Erzi, 1-21-2012, “Republican Presidential Race 'Hijacks' China-U.S. Relations”, China Daily, http://worldmeets.us/chinadaily000032.shtml#axzz1pQ5WA0fX

Are Republicans making statements about China that they will later regret? According to senior editor Fei Erzi of the state-run China Daily, Republican candidates have picked up on the 'sadness of Americans' at not being able to 'influence global economic outcomes. So they have decided to ' go to extremes,' raising the likelihood of a trade war. People both in and out of the United States and are closely watching the Republican presidential campaign. With the Republican caucus in Iowa and primary in New Hampshire, Americans officially embarked on the road to November's critical presidential election. The journey will be heavily influenced by differing interpretations of the American economy and U.S relationships around the world. Some people lament the extent to which the America has lost its competitive edge to other nations, especially in Asia. There is sadness that the U.S. can no longer influence global economic outcomes. So it should come as no surprise when candidates go to extremes to make a point clear in the heat of the campaign. They have already begun, having allowed domestic U.S. politics to hijack Sino-U.S. relations. Republicans candidates emphasize that it is necessary to confront China. Mitt Romney, the presumed frontrunner, is already attacking Beijing. He asserts that President Obama has allowed China to "run all over us" when it comes to taking American jobs. He favors imposing tariffs on China to "punish" it for "currency manipulation." But China is much more than what Republicans think. The Pew Research Center has identified three core Republican groups, based on responses to certain questions. About 80 percent of "staunch conservatives" want the U.S. to get tough with China on economic issues, but both "Main Street Republicans" and "Libertarians" are evenly divided on whether Washington should get tough or build stronger economic ties. Should we be angry that China figures so prominently in an election campaign on the other side of the Pacific? Washington advocates of stronger Sino-U.S. trade and cooperation look with concern at the anti-Beijing rhetoric, fearing that it could lead our countries into a trade war. The U.S.-China Business Council has even produced fact sheets detailing the impact of China trade on key primary and caucus states. New Hampshire, for example, exports goods totaling $412 million to China every year, making it the third-largest exporter to China among U.S. states. South Carolina exports goods worth $2.2 billion to China. In addition, annual exports from Nevada to China rose from about $11 million in 1996 to more than $455 million in 2010, according to data provided by the state. There is little doubt that U.S. global economic dominance is coming to end. The future will see growing competition for influence and market share from other economies.

#### Romney sparks trade war with China

Nina Hachigian, senior fellow at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, and Jacob Stokes, 3-14-2012, “Romney’s China trade talk is hot air”, Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0312/74000.html

Romney has also tapped former Bush Commerce Secretary Carlos Gutierrez to be his top advisor on trade. Gutierrez has consistently opposed legislation to label China a currency manipulator, yet this is a move Romney promises on “day one.” As Guiterrez knows, labeling China a currency manipulator on “day one” is not a silver-bullet solution to U.S. trade problems with China. He noted in a 2007 letter to Congress that pegging China as a currency manipulator “will not accomplish our shared goal of persuading China to implement economic reforms and move more quickly to a market-determined exchange rate.” Romney says he will label China on “day one,” but what is his plan for day two? Declaring China a manipulator is a symbolically hostile gesture, coming as it would before he will have ever spoken to any Chinese leader officially. Yet, all this designation requires is further talks with Beijing — made all the more difficult by the declaration itself. This is why Jon Huntsman, a former U.S. ambassador to China who now supports Romney, had formerly described the governor’s policy as “wrongheaded,” saying it would spark a trade war that would harm America. What’s more, focusing only on currency ignores the need for solutions on broader issues — including protecting intellectual property; opening up government procurement, and ending the practice of demanding companies hand over technology in exchange for market access. Romney acknowledges those problems. But he offers no new solutions beyond what the Obama administration is already doing. Romney‘s “Reagan Economic Zone” also bears a striking resemblance to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Oscillating between two extremes – bad-mouthing trade enforcement measures as union-coddling, then threatening immediate sanctions– to score political points is no way to shape national policy toward the fastest-growing, most-populated country on the planet. We need a successful strategy that gets China to play by the rules so that both countries can benefit from free and fair trade. Romney should be explaining how he will strengthen the robust efforts started under the Obama administration. Not first opposing them and then pretending they didn’t happen.

### Obama Good – US-China Relations

#### GOP ensures China bashing, starts a trade war

JOSH GERSTEIN, 11-22-2011, “The GOP's China syndrome”, Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1111/68952.html

Mitt Romney says America is at war with China — a “trade war” over its undervalued currency. “They’re stealing our jobs. And we’re gonna stand up to China,” the former Massachusetts governor declared in a recent Republican presidential debate, arguing that the United States should threaten to impose tariffs on Chinese imports. When Romney steps on stage tonight for another debate, this one devoted to foreign policy, that kind of China-bashing is likely to be a favorite theme. With a moribund economy and relatively little traction for other international issues, the threat posed by cheap Chinese imports and Chinese purchases of U.S. debt is an irresistible target.

### Obama Good – Iran War

#### GOP win causes Iran strike – Obama key to containment

James Traub, staff writer, January/February 2012, “Foreign Affairs,” Washington Monthly, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january\_february\_2012/features/foreign\_affairs034475.php?page=3#

But elsewhere, a Republican president would turn up the dial of confrontation. Iran is a particularly stark example, since Obama’s rivals have described his engagement policy there as complicity with evil (Rick Santorum: “We sided with evil because our president believes our enemies are legitimately aggrieved”). As a candidate, Obama argued that the U.S. had sacrificed even the possibility of finding common ground with nations like Iran by refusing to talk to them. As president, he replaced the bellicose moralism of George Bush’s “axis of evil” with a more anodyne lexicon of “mutual respect” for “mutual interests.” He took pains to extend greetings to the Iranian people on the holiday of Nowruz and to refer to the country as the “Islamic Republic of Iran.” In his speech in Cairo in June 2009, Obama even acknowledged America’s role in the 1953 overthrow of a democratically elected Iranian leader. There is more to this strategy than Republicans like to acknowledge. Perhaps Obama did believe (naively) that this more beguiling language would make it easier for the Iranian leadership to come out of its shell and make concessions on its nuclear program. But officials around him said from the outset that his ulterior purpose was to help forge an international coalition around tough measures toward Iran by first showing that the Iranians would not respond to gentle ones. And in this he succeeded: in 2010, Obama persuaded Russia and China to accept tough sanctions on Iran adopted by the UN Security Council. Iran is much more isolated today than it was only a few years ago. The Obama administration has been using clandestine methods as well, and in all likelihood collaborated with Israel to develop the Stuxnet computer virus, which disrupted Iran’s nuclear centrifuges. Indeed, here, as elsewhere, Obama has proved to be less “liberal,” and more traditionally pragmatic, than many of his supporters hoped or his critics have charged. He has increased the use of Predator drones and continued the practice of extraordinary rendition of terror suspects to other countries, despite criticisms from human rights groups. Many of the old-line foreign policy professionals who served under the first President Bush, like Brent Scowcroft, the former national security advisor, feel more comfortable with Obama’s conduct of foreign policy than with the more confrontational one that Romney and others promise. (Only Jon Huntsman, of all the Republican candidates, has sought the advice of this group.) A Republican president would thus move American foreign policy not from the left to the right, but from the center to the right. For all Obama’s efforts, his Iran policy is at best a qualified success; the leadership there is still enriching uranium, still apparently seeking to design a warhead, still posing a profound threat to Israel. The Republican candidates insist that Iran hasn’t capitulated because Obama has not applied enough pressure. They would, of course, cut out the deferential language and the holiday greetings. They would attempt regime change, if from a distance. But the real difference between a hypothetical Republican president and Obama—and it is a very important one—is that a Republican would be prepared to launch an attack on Iran designed to slow their development of nuclear technology, or would give Israel the go-ahead to do so. Yes, Obama has said that “all options are on the table,” but he might not be prepared to attack Iran. The Republicans say they would. “If we reelect Barack Obama,” Mitt Romney said in Spartanburg, “Iran will have a nuclear weapon. And if you elect Mitt Romney, Iran will not have a nuclear weapon.” At bottom, Obama’s policy is designed to buy time in hopes that the collective bite of sanctions will change the Iranian calculus, or that some as yet unforeseeable change inside Iran will produce a new policy. He seeks, in Cold War language, to contain Iran. Romney and others argue that the U.S. doesn’t have the luxury of containment—that Iran represents an existential threat, which must be stopped now. But airstrikes, whether by the U.S. or Israel, would not wholly eliminate Iran’s nuclear program, and would provoke very serious blowback. Leon Panetta, Obama’s defense secretary, has warned the Israelis of possible “unintended consequences” of such a mission, including attacks on American soldiers, diplomats, and assets across the Middle East. And while some Arab elites might welcome an attack, ordinary citizens in the Middle East would be enraged. The U.S. could thus pay a very grave price for a relatively modest gain.

### Obama Good – Iran War

#### Romney strikes Iran

Seth McLaughlin, 11-12-2011, “Romney, Gingrich would wage war on Iran,” Washington Times, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/nov/12/gop-candidates-tackle-iran-drone-strikes-and-forei/?utm\_source=RSS\_Feed&utm\_medium=RSS

Two of the top Republican presidential candidates said Saturday they’d go to war against Iran to prevent it from acquiring nuclear weapons, following a new report that suggests the leaders of the Middle Eastern nation continue to pursue such weapons. During a debate at Wofford College, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich criticized President Obama’s handling of the situation, while clearly stating the use of military force is a last resort that has to be on the table. “The president should have built a credible threat of military action and made it very clear that the United States of America is willing, in the final analysis, if necessary, to take military action to keep Iran from having a nuclear weapon,” Romney said. “One thing you can know and that is if we re-elect Barack Obama, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. And if we elect Mitt Romney — if you elect me as the next president — they will not have a nuclear weapon.” The early agreement between Mr. Romney and Mr. Gingrich kicked off a 90-minute debate at Wofford College and gave way to the candidates spelling out sharp differences over whether waterboarding amounted to torture, drone strikes against U.S. citizens are legal and foreign assistance to Pakistan and other countries should be reconsidered. The issue of Iran immediately took center stage, thanks to the report released last week by the International Atomic Energy Agencies report that said Iran was conducting experiments “relevant to the development of a nuclear device.” To prevent the Middle Eastern nation from moving in that direction, several of the candidates — with the exception of Texas Rep. Ron Paul — agreed that the federal government must combine stiffer economic sanctions, support for the nation’s dissidents and covert operations aimed at eliminate scientists and systems involved. “First of all, maximum covert operations to block and disrupt the Iranian program, including taking out their scientists, including breaking up their systems, all of it covertly, all of it deniable,” Mr. Gingrich said. But they did not all agree on whether — or when — to use military force, with Mr. Romney and Mr. Gingrich saying they would.

#### New IAEA report would massively increase the risk of a GOP Iran strike

Ali Gharib, 11-10-2011, “Romney Team Iran Hawk,” Thinkprogress, http://thinkprogress.org/security/2011/11/10/366017/romney-adviser-iran-edelman/

The release this week of a U.N. report with detailed findings pointing toward potential Iranian nuclear weapons work saw a chorus of right-wing calls for war with Iran. Yesterday, GOP presidential hopeful Mitt Romney came out with a Wall Street Journal op-ed threatening war with the Islamic Republic, delivering the message to the Iranians that “If you want peace, prepare for war.” In the wake of the International Atomic Energy Agency’s report on Iran — which, despite the hype, may not be quite the “game-changer ” hawks had hoped for — one prominent Romney adviser went further than the candidate, calling for a military strike against Iran. Eric Edelman , a former staffer to Vice President Dick Cheney and board member of a neoconservative pressure group , warned in the journal Foreign Policy that, if Iran goes nuclear, there would be a series of terrible consequence. After raising the “possibility of an Israeli-Iranian nuclear conflict” — ie, nuclear war — in an article headlined “Why Obama Should Take Out Iran’s Nuclear Program: The Case For Striking Before It’s Too Late ,” Edelman and his co-authors wrote: The closer Iran gets to acquiring nuclear weapons, the fewer options will be available to stop its progress. At the same time, Iran’s incentives to back down will only decrease as it approaches the nuclear threshold. Given these trends, the United States faces the difficult decision of using military force soon to prevent Iran from going nuclear, or living with a nuclear Iran and the regional fallout. Edelman’s hawkishness on Iran is not new: In a January article in the same journal, he wrote with the same co-authors: “The military option should not be dismissed because of the appealing but flawed notion that containment is a relatively easy or low-risk solution to a very difficult problem.” As ThinkProgress has noted, hawks abound on the Romney campaign foreign policy team — among them, those who pushed for the Iraq war and a slew who’ve pressed the case for attacking Iran. One even advocates for a controversial Iranian exile group that the State Department considers a terrorist organization. (HT: Marc Lynch )

### Obama Good – EPA

#### GOP win kills all environmental regulation

David Roberts, staff writer, January/February 2012, “The Environment,” Washington Monthly, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january\_february\_2012/features/the\_environment034476.php

One example of this is the TRAIN Act (that stands for Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation). Introduced by Republican Representative John Sullivan, of Oklahoma, in September, it would create a special committee of cabinet members to analyze the costs to industry of any new EPA regulations. By law, EPA rule making is concerned only with public health and feasibility. States, which are charged with implementing the rules, are allowed to take costs to industry into consideration; in writing the rules, the EPA is not. TRAIN would introduce cost considerations into the rule-making process itself, a radical change and diminution of the law. (According to the EPA’s intensive, peer-reviewed studies, between 1990 and 2010 alone the Clean Air Act will produce almost $2 trillion in public health benefits; the cost to industry will reach just $65 billion.) Or consider the REINS Act (Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny). This law would require that every “economically significant” federal regulation (one that has an annual impact of $100 million or more) be affirmatively approved by Congress. Again: no rule would go into effect until it has been voted through by both houses of Congress and signed by the president. If a regulation is not voted on within seventy legislative working days of being sent to Congress, it is “tabled.” That is, it dies. It’s difficult to overstate how radical a change this would represent for U.S. government. It would subject fifty to a hundred regulations a year to the partisanship, rancor, and gridlock of Congress. Every rule would be a new opportunity for lobbying and industry influence. Worse, legal observers say the bill does not clearly prohibit a filibuster in the Senate, raising the possibility that a determined minority of forty senators could effectively shut down federal rule making. REINS would not overturn the Clean Air Act or shutter the EPA, but it would end forward momentum in environmental law, freezing it in place. Green drift would end for good. It might sound like something out of the far-right fringe, but the TRAIN Act passed the House by a vote of 249 to 169—out of 234 Republican votes, 230 were in favor. The Senate has not voted on TRAIN yet, but it has voted on bills that include REINS twice, once garnering forty-seven votes for it, once forty. Crippling the EPA is now a consensus objective in the mainstream of the Republican Party. So far, the Democratic Senate has prevented the House’s anti-environment votes from becoming laws. But if the economy continues to sputter and Republicans have a 2010-style sweep year, says analyst Nate Silver, “it’s within the realm of possibility that they could gain a net of thirteen seats.” That would give them a majority large enough to override filibusters. (Given the number of Democrats who have demonstrated willingness to vote against clean air protections, they might even have four or five votes to spare.) Should that happen, a Republican Congress would almost certainly pass the TRAIN Act, the REINS Act, and bills blocking new EPA rules on ozone, mercury, and carbon dioxide. That would leave the fate of the Clean Air Act—indeed, the fate of the entire environmental regulatory apparatus— in the hands of the president. Obama has said he would veto these bills. Rick Perry and Newt Gingrich would not. What would Mitt Romney do? As Massachusetts governor, he passed strict new clean air standards and proclaimed boldly that “I will not protect jobs that kill people.” Is there any of that Romney left? Or will he go with the anti-environmental flow of the national Republican Party? America’s environmental laws have faced threats before. But depending for survival on the tensile strength of Mitt Romney’s integrity? That would be a precarious position indeed.

### Obama Good – EPA

#### Obama is critical to protect EPA regulations – GOP president will overturn them

Ken Thomas, 1-11-2012. “Obama counters GOP, praises work of EPA”, AP, http://www.usatoday.com/USCP/PNI/NEWS/2012-01-11-APUSObama\_ST\_U.htm

President Barack Obama defended the work of the Environmental Protection Agency on Tuesday, saying he stands with the agency that has taken a beating from Republicans in Congress and on the presidential campaign trail for regulations that the GOP maintains will cripple the economy and kill jobs. Obama, making his first-ever visit to the EPA, took issue with those claims, saying he does not buy the notion that there is a choice between clean air and clean water and a growing economy. He said the mission of the agency is "vital." "That is a false debate. We don't have to choose between dirty air and dirty water or a growing economy. We can make sure that we are doing right by our environment and, in fact, putting people back to work all across America," Obama told about 800 EPA employees gathered at headquarters in Washington, D.C., reminding them that, before Republican President Richard Nixon created the agency in 1970, rivers caught fire and were devoid of life. "When I hear folks grumbling about environmental policy, you almost want to do a 'Back to the Future' reminder of folks of what happened when we didn't have a strong EPA," Obama said, adding, "You have a president who is grateful for your work and will stand with you every inch of the way." Under Obama, the EPA helped draft a historic rise in fuel-economy standards for new cars and trucks, issued the first-ever rules to curb mercury from the nation's coal-fired power plants and started regulating the heat-trapping gases blamed for global warming. Yet, at times, Obama has had to scale back his aspirations on the environment in the face of a weak economy and political resistance. The Republican takeover of the House in 2010 killed his campaign pledge to pass comprehensive legislation to address global warming. Since then, the House has passed a string of bills to block EPA rules, all of which have failed in the Democratic-led Senate and drawn a veto threat from the White House. But the true low point for Obama on the environment came in September when, faced with criticism from industry and Republicans, he decided against strengthening a standard for the main ingredient in lung-damaging smog, going against the recommendation of agency scientists and the EPA's administrator, Lisa Jackson. Obama redeemed himself in environmentalists' eyes late last year. First, he delayed a decision to build a pipeline to bring tar-sands oil from Canada to the Texas Gulf Coast. Then, in December, over the objections of Republicans and industry groups, the EPA finalized the first-ever standards to control toxic-mercury pollution from power plants. Now, in the midst of a re-election campaign, the big question is whether Obama will continue that trend. Regulations to curb power-plant pollution are still in the works, including a much-anticipated proposal to control greenhouse gases from new power plants. Meanwhile, Republican presidential hopefuls continue to criticize the agency's actions under Obama, saying its regulations have placed a massive burden on businesses and hindered economic growth. Most of the GOP contenders have said they would throw out the most expensive and cumbersome rules issued on Obama's watch.

#### GOP win in November ensures the EPA will be stripped – republican ideology

JOHN M. BRODER, 8-17-2011. “Bashing E.P.A. Is New Theme in G.O.P. Race”, NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/18/us/politics/18epa.html

The Environmental Protection Agency is emerging as a favorite target of the Republican presidential candidates, who portray it as the very symbol of a heavy-handed regulatory agenda imposed by the Obama administration that they say is strangling the economy. Representative Michele Bachmann of Minnesota wants to padlock the E.P.A.’s doors, as does former Speaker Newt Gingrich. Gov. Rick Perry of Texas wants to impose an immediate moratorium on environmental regulation. Representative Ron Paul of Texas wants environmental disputes settled by the states or the courts. Herman Cain, a businessman, wants to put many environmental regulations in the hands of an independent commission that includes oil and gas executives. Jon M. Huntsman Jr., the former Utah governor, thinks most new environmental regulations should be shelved until the economy improves. Only Mitt Romney, the former Massachusetts governor, has a kind word for the E.P.A., and that is qualified by his opposition to proposed regulation of carbon dioxide and other gases that contribute to global warming. Opposition to regulation and skepticism about climate change have become tenets of Republican orthodoxy, but they are embraced with extraordinary intensity this year because of the faltering economy, high fuel prices, the Tea Party passion for smaller government and an activist Republican base that insists on strict adherence to the party’s central agenda. But while attacks on the E.P.A., climate-change science and environmental regulation more broadly are surefire applause lines with many Republican primary audiences, these views may prove a liability in the general election, pollsters and analysts say.

### Obama Good – Health Care

#### GOP win kills health care

Harold Pollack, Helen Ross Prof at the School of Social Service Administration at U Chicago, January/February 2012, “Obamacare,” Washington Monthly, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january\_february\_2012/features/obamacare034478.php

With majorities in both houses, Republicans would surely try to pass a full repeal of the ACA. If Obama is reelected, he will veto it. Yet if Obama loses, what leverage or incentive would President Romney really have, come January 2013, to wage an internecine party fight to preserve elements of his predecessor’s signature domestic policy legacy? None that I can think of. Health care reform advocates are sometimes comforted by thoughts of the filibuster. Even if Republicans do win both elected branches of government, the Democrats will still probably retain well over forty seats in the Senate. Presuming they can stick together, that ought to be enough to block a Republican bill to fully repeal the ACA. One is far less comforted, however, after considering some realities of the budget reconciliation process, the Senate procedure that allows budget-related bills to be voted on and passed with only fifty-one votes. Paul Starr, in his masterful history of health reform, Remedy and Reaction, notes an infuriating fact: Washington’s de facto ground rules require sixty Senate votes for Democratic health policy measures, but only fifty for Republican ones. For historical and personal-political reasons, moderate and conservative Senate Democrats refused to allow their party to use budget reconciliation to pass health reform; they demanded the bill get sixty votes. As Thomas Mann and Norman Ornstein describe in their essay above, Republicans operate under no such constraints. Moreover, conservatives are already building the political foundation for slaying the ACA in reconciliation through a massive “repeal and replace” bill passed on party lines with no possibility for a filibuster. Former George W. Bush Office of Management and Budget official James Capretta notes that Democrats themselves used reconciliation during health reform’s legislative endgame after Scott Brown’s election to iron out differences between the House and Senate versions of the final bill. GOP lawmakers can therefore present a politically plausible argument for using reconciliation themselves to repeal the law. Capretta told me he isn’t worried about voter backlash: “If the president has won based on repeal and replace, people will be expecting it.”

#### GOP win ensures Healthcare will be repealed – all candidates pledged to it

William Teach, 1-16-2012, “Politico Notices That A GOP Win In November Could Mean The End Of ObamaCare”, http://www.thepiratescove.us/2012/01/16/politico-notices-that-a-gop-win-in-november-could-mean-the-end-of-obamacare/

Of course, since so many liberals and liberal companies have already received waivers, it wouldn’t mean all that much to themselves (Politico) Think the Supreme Court is where the future of President Barack Obama’s health care law will be settled? Think again. The real verdict on the future of Obama’s signature achievement will come in November — and the law’s supporters say a Republican sweep could pose a bigger threat to the law than the nine justices ever could. The court is expected to hand down its decision at the end of its term in June. But most legal observers doubt that it will strike down the whole of the Affordable Care Act, even if it finds the mandate unconstitutional. In contrast, the Republican candidates are all on record as promising to scrap the whole thing. Yes, they are, though I think The Politico is underestimating what a SCOTUS decision against the ObamaCare mandate would mean, since there is no severability within the law. While a Republican president wouldn’t be able to hand out waivers for states to get out of all of the health law’s requirements, as some of the presidential contenders suggest, he’d be able to direct the new Health and Human Services secretary to slow-walk pivotal programs, dramatically relax the regulations and possibly defund the law. Why not? Perhaps the Republican could give a waiver to right handed people on January 20th, 2013, and left handed people on the 21st. Let’s not forget that the waivers Obama has handed out have a limited time-span of a few years. They aren’t permanent. Front-runner Mitt Romney has pledged to repeal the law, and his policy aides are figuring out just how much dismantling could be done through the White House and HHS, without congressional action.

### Obama Good – Health Care

#### GOP win repeals health care

David Paul Kuhn, RCP, 6-17-2011, “Health Care Law Could Fall,”http://www.realclearpolitics.com/printpage/?url=http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2011/06/17/health\_care\_reform\_repeal\_could\_fall\_obama\_legacy\_democrats\_2012\_court\_senate\_reconciliation-full.html

It was the first minutes of Monday's Republican debate. Michele Bachmann pledged more than to simply "not rest until I repeal Obamacare." Her subsequent words betrayed the higher stakes ahead: "This is the symbol and the signature issue of President Obama, during his entire tenure." Obama's signature legislation is indeed on the line. As is his tenure. His legacy. This vision of liberal governance. It could all still, after so much, fall apart. There are myriad potential scenarios. The Supreme Court overturns the health care law (or at least its individual mandate). Republicans win a Senate majority in 2012. Obama is defeated. These scenarios set the stage for (potentially) lethal blows to Obama's definitive legislation. One legislative tactic, called reconciliation, empowers Republicans to take down critical components of the law with only a simple majority in the Senate -- though that move is far easier written than done. Definite predictions are a professional hazard this far out. As top-shelf congressional scholar Tom Mann, of the Brookings Institution, put it, "I honestly don't know what will happen." But? "But listen, I think the 2012 election is hugely consequential," Mann continued. "If Republicans took control of the White House, as well as the Senate, even being a few votes short of cloture, I'm convinced they would succeed in repealing most or all" of the health care law. However it's done, if it is done, much of Obama's legacy would also be undone. Obama and the Democratic leadership made decisions in 2009 that will reverberate politically for decades. Democratic philosophy -- active-state liberalism, government as a means to promote the common good -- was fully invested in the choices of Obama's first year, a point this writer has admittedly belabored. Democrats made immense legislative sacrifices to win their prize. Those sacrifices could be for naught. The new New Deal that never came to pass. Recall that rare chance. A president had the political capital to cobble a bill large enough to substantially impact the economy. But the average American worker was never bailed out. We cannot know what might have been. What if Obama had focused his first year on the great issue of this time, as FDR did in his time? Obama won the health care overhaul, which was never popular. He could have certainly won a major jobs bill, which was always popular. Would that have granted Obama momentum for more? A financial bill that actually ended "too big to fail"? Other Democratic ambitions -- some measure of legislation on climate change or immigration? Obama sought the great liberal dream instead -- universal health care. The White House seemingly did not grasp the gamble. Obama was wrongly said to have remade our politics, whereas his majority was born with the September 2008 crash and in time, fell as that fact was forgotten. The distance between mandate and actions grew. His coalition predictably fissured with that distance, as he learned demographics are not destiny. Even the everyman concern for health care costs went largely unaddressed. Independents predictably left Obama his first summer in office. The economy was recovering but health care consumed DC. Bailout for the big guy. Health care for the little guy. The middleman was forgotten. Independents never returned. Yet at least, from Democrats' perspective, they had something historic to show for all they sacrificed. And if the law holds, 32 million more Americans will have health insurance. Not small sacrifices. But no small feat. That historic consolation could, however, be undone. As for conservatives, on this matter history is synonymous with notoriety. Newt Gingrich was once a supporter of a mandate. At Monday's debate, even he agreed that opposing the individual mandate should be a litmus test in the GOP primary. That individual mandate is the keystone of the law. Without it, reform surely fails. Last year, House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan, R-Wis., acknowledged that Republicans wouldn't be able to repeal health care -- if they can -- until at least 2013. This spring, Gingrich predicted that the legislation "will be repealed ... probably by March or April 2013." He added that even with Obama in office, the president "can block them from repeal; I don't think he can coerce them into funding." Gingrich has always been a no-shot presidential candidate. Yet the former House speaker certainly knows the machinations of Congress. Should Republicans control Congress, Democrats' vulnerability is real. "Republicans could refuse to fund aspects of its implementation," Mann said of this scenario. "Fail to confirm nominees to get the job done. Put other pressure on the regulatory front. They can really weaken it and make it extremely difficult to really move forward with everything from the effectiveness research to the changes in the basis of payment. Yeah, they can make it really tough." Mann's caveat, however, is worth keeping in mind. Those who know Congress best agree that "nobody really knows," as fellow Brookings congressional expert Sarah Binder said. "Neither extreme is likely. It's unlikely that the health care law remains in its original condition, as Democrats want it to be, or that it's entirely repealed," noted Binder, also a professor at George Washington University. What if the GOP does not control both the executive and legislative branches? "Republicans will have a tough time defunding health care," she said. But imagine the GOP controls Congress and the White House. Yet they still lack a Senate super majority. Is reconciliation the way Republicans rescind the law? "My hunch, it's probably the only way." Reconciliation allows the majority party to neutralize a filibuster if the measure involves budgetary matters. Democrats utilized reconciliation to pass part of the final health care law, but Republicans have historically used the procedure most, including on measures such as welfare reform. They will not hesitate to utilize the tactic once more. But a yellow light flashes here too. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office determined that rescinding the health care law increases the federal deficit by about $230 billion over the next decade. Any potential reconciliation bill must compensate for that gap, and then some. But with the power, Republicans will likely have the political will to find a way. These legislative war games could prove moot. The Supreme Court might hold the law, or critical portions, unconstitutional. In the past, court mavens said that outcome was unlikely. It's now unclear how the court might rule, as Slate's Dahlia Lithwick has smartly explained. It could consider the law next year. But it's really an electoral matter outside the court. Democrats have 23 Senate seats up for re-election in 2012. Republicans have 10. Republicans could plausibly hold the House and win a Senate majority in 2012. Thus, the GOP's best chance to overhaul the overhaul is likely to be in 2013. Why? Recall all those foolish predictions that health care would become suddenly popular after passage. They ignored the timeline. People don't appreciate what they do not yet have. The converse should, however, inform GOP strategy. People do not miss what they never had. In 2014, those 32 million Americans who lack coverage will begin to gain it. Politicians cannot easily cut entitlements once, well, people feel entitled to them. They are called third rails for a reason. Congress has never repealed landmark social welfare legislation within years of passage. But previous major social legislation also enjoyed some significant measure of bipartisan support. The hyper-partisan nature of health care's passage explains its vulnerability. This vulnerability only matters if the GOP has a historic victory in 2012. That potential victory also means that Democrats must consider all that could still be lost. In this age of austerity, their vision of health care reform is on the line. And so is the Democratic vision itself. Democrats had hoped to take their medicine up front, in the midterms. The worst was surely behind them -- they paid a great electoral cost in 2010. The benefits were surely ahead of them. Or so they thought. Last year, as the president signed the bill into law, you could almost feel the collective Democratic relief. Obama lifted the last pen off the desk. And simply said, "We are done." We'll see.

### Health Care Good – Economy

#### Key to the economy

Jonathan Gruber, Prof of Economics @ MIT, 12-4-2008, “Medicine for the Job Market,” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/04/opinion/04gruber.html?\_r=1&ref=opinion

Given the present need to address the economic crisis, many people say the government cannot afford a big investment in health care, that these plans are going nowhere fast. But this represents a false choice, because health care reform is good for our economy. As the country slips into what is possibly the worst downturn since the Depression, nearly all experts agree that Washington should stimulate demand with new spending. And one of the most effective ways to spend would be to give states money to enroll more people in Medicaid and the State Children’s Health Insurance Plan. This would free up state money for rebuilding roads and bridges and other public works projects — spending that could create jobs. Health care reform can be an engine of job growth in other ways, too. Most proposals call for investments in health information technology, including the computerization of patient medical records. During the campaign, for example, Mr. Obama proposed spending $50 billion on such technology. The hope is that computerized recordkeeping, and the improved sharing of information among doctors that it would enable, would improve the quality of patient care and perhaps also lower medical costs. More immediately, it would create jobs in the technology sector. After all, somebody would need to develop the computer systems and operate them for thousands of American health care providers. Expanded insurance coverage would also drive demand for high-paying, rewarding jobs in health services. Most reform proposals emphasize primary care, much of which can be provided by nurse practitioners, registered nurses and physician’s assistants. These jobs could provide a landing spot for workers who have lost jobs in other sectors of the economy. Fundamental health care reform would also stimulate more consumer spending, as previously uninsured families would no longer need to save every extra penny to cover a medical emergency. When the federal government expanded Medicaid in the 1990s, my own research has shown, the newly insured significantly increased their spending on consumer goods. Universal health insurance coverage would also address economic problems that existed before this downturn began — and that are likely to linger after growth resumes. In our current system, people who leave or lose their jobs often must go without insurance for months or years, and this discourages people from moving to positions where they could be more productive. Most reform proposals call for the creation of pools of insurance coverage that would guarantee access to high-quality, affordable care for people who are self-employed or out of work, increasing their mobility. If this coverage focuses on disease prevention and wellness, it could also improve the health, and thereby the productivity, of the workforce. In the long term, the greatest fiscal threat facing this nation is the growth in the costs of health care. These costs have more than tripled as a share of our economy since 1950, and show no signs of abating. The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that the share of the economy devoted to healthcare will double by 2050.

### Health Care Good – Space

#### Health care reform is key to prevent budgetary collapse from entitlement costs

Jason Rosenbaum, Deputy Director of Online Campaigns, Health Care for America Now, 2-23-2009,

http://healthcare.nationaljournal.com/2009/02/obamas-fiscal-responsibility-s.php "Obama’s Fiscal Summit and Healthcare”

As pointed out by others here and elsewhere, Medicare and Medicaid are in fact set to rise in cost dramatically, and this is indeed a problem. And it's not just Medicare and Medicaid. Our entire health care system is set to rise in cost, a cost that's projected to reach almost 20% of GDP by 2017 if current trends continue. So it's not just the federal government that has a problem. With one out of every five dollars in our economy writ large projected to be spent on health care, every person in this country has a problem. The cost of health care must be brought under control to claim fiscal responsibility, and not just the cost of Medicare and Medicaid but the cost of health care for everyone. So, how do we control costs? We control costs first and foremost by getting everyone in America affordable coverage with benefits that meet their needs. We do this by giving people a choice to keep their private health insurance plan or the option to buy into a public health insurance plan, filling in the gaps in private insurance so everyone can have coverage. When people are covered by insurance, they get the care they need, not just catastrophic care at the emergency room when their health problems become dire (which is much more expensive). This prevention lowers cost and improves health outcomes. As this chart from the Center for Economic and Policy Research shows, if we can get our health care costs in line with other countries (the "Low Health Care Costs line) as opposed to our projected exponential growth, our budget deficit will stabilize. Fiscal responsibility therefore means controlling all health care costs, not just Medicare and Medicaid. President Obama understands this problem, and though it may require an upfront federal investment, in the long run it's the only way to use taxpayer money wisely.

#### Failure to fix entitlement costs kills funding for NASA, ending space exploration

Charles Miller, President of Space Policy Consulting, Inc., and Jeff Foust, editor and publisher of The Space Review, April 14, 2008, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1106/1

Obviously, these long-term trends in Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare are not sustainable, and our national leaders will be forced to do something about it. This is our point. A near-term fiscal crisis is emerging in the next decade, and solving it will be the responsibility of the next President of the United States and the US Congress. Recent history provides a taste of what NASA may be facing in the very near future. During the Bush Administration NASA has done reasonably well in terms of spending: its budget, in constant 2008 dollars, has increased from $16.3 billion in fiscal year 2001 (the last Clinton Administration budget) to $17.1 billion in fiscal year 2008. This 0.7% real increase per year, on average, is far short of the increases that many space advocates have been seeking, but it is better than what some other agencies have received during the same period. However, this small budget increase has taken place during a time when balancing the budget has not been a priority for either a Republican President or the U.S. Congress. By comparison, during the Clinton Administration, when both the Democratic White House and Republican Congress sought (and achieved) a balanced budget, NASA fared far worse: in constant 2008 dollars, its budget fell from $20 billion in fiscal year 1993 to $16.3 billion in 2001, a decline of nearly 20 percent. Considering the budgetary challenges created by the retirement of the baby boomers, the next graph may be a better guide to the austerity NASA will face in the years to come than its experience of the last few years. These fiscal pressures will force the next president—regardless of whoever is elected in November—to make some hard decisions in the years to come about discretionary spending. It is unrealistic to expect that NASA will somehow be immune to pressures to cut spending. A budget cut in the next Administration that is equivalent to last decade’s cut would result in reduction of NASA’s budget of over $3 billion per year. If that happens, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the current exploration architecture to continue in anything resembling its current form and schedule. It will be significantly delayed, radically altered, or even cancelled. Should that happen, is there a way to keep the Vision for Space Exploration alive?

### Health Care Good – Space

#### Extinction

Paul Spudis, Principal Investigator in the Planetary Geology Program of the NASA Office of Space Science, Solar System Exploration Division and Senior Professional Staff, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, 8-4 2004, http://www.spudislunarresources.com/Opinion\_Editorial/The%20Space%20Program%20and%20the%20Meaning%20of%20Life.htm

The race to the Moon did more than prove American technical skill and the power of a free society. The real lesson and gift from Apollo was a wholly unexpected glimpse into our future. From both the chemical and physical evidence of impact (which we learned from the record of the lunar rocks) and the fossil record, we discovered that large body collisions had occurred in our past and will occur again in our future. Such catastrophes resulted in the widespread destruction of life, in some cases instantaneously eliminating more than 90% of all living species. In short, we discovered that ultimately, life on Earth is doomed. Our new understanding of impact as a fundamental geological force, leaves us only with the question of when, not if, the next large collision will occur. And ‘when’ is something we cannot predict. Human civilization is cumulative. Our culture provides positive and beautiful things through music, art and knowledge – it embodies the wisdom of all who have gone before us. With that wisdom, we have rejected the evil doctrines of slavery, Nazism and communism. People live longer, happier and more productive lives as time goes on. So one must ask, are we here for a reason and if so, to what purpose? Before passing the torch to their children, humans feel the need to create something of long-term value – something that will exist long after their time here on Earth. Be it a garden or a cure for cancer, we want to leave this world a little bit better than we found it. Will the prospect of our extinction harden our resolve to survive, or will it hasten the decay of our culture? Without an escape hatch, our children will lose focus - lose sight of goals and grand visions. The President’s Vision for Space directs us to extend human reach by developing new capabilities in space travel. Returning to the Moon will facilitate that goal. There we will gain technical ability and learn how to use the abundant energy and material resources waiting on other worlds. With the knowledge of how to “live off the land” in space, we can move out into the universe – populating one world after another. We must not die out here on Earth. Our values, culture and ability to leave this planet set us apart as a species. We have looked into the past and have seen the future of our world. Life here on Earth is destined for extinction. By venturing forth beyond Earth, we can ensure our survival. To extend and preserve humanity and human achievement, we must advance new capabilities in space travel. The President has asked for $1 Billion (about 0.0004 of the Federal budget) spread over the next four years, to begin this journey. As we acquire capability with resources derived from the Moon and elsewhere, we will create a spacefaring infrastructure.

## Federalism DA

### Federalism DA Shell 1/2

#### US federalism strong now.

Nick Dranias, Chair for Constitutional Government and is Director of the Joseph and Dorothy Donnelly Moller Center for Constitutional Government at the Goldwater Institute, 3/24/2012, “We Should Accept the Supreme Court’s Invitation to Check and Balance Washington, D.C,” http://libertylawsite.org/2012/03/24/we-should-accept-the-supreme-courts-invitation-to-check-and-balance-washington-d-c/

Rarely does a unanimous Supreme Court announce a sea change in the balance of power between the states and the federal government. But nearly a year ago, on June 16, 2011, the Court did just that. In Bond v. United States, the Court effectively extended an invitation to strategic lawmaking and litigation under the Tenth Amendment. Constitutionalists should accept the Court’s invitation. The unanimous opinion penned by Justice Anthony Kennedy could signal the beginning of the end of the federal government’s inexorable expansion into areas the Tenth Amendment reserves exclusively to state and local government, such as local criminal law, health care and firearms regulation. With unusual clarity, the Court ruled our system of dual sovereignty denies “any one government complete jurisdiction over all the concerns of public life.”It underscored that the primary reason for dividing power between the states and the federal government is to protect individual liberty; observing, “Federalism is more than an exercise in setting the boundary between different institutions of government for their own integrity . . . Federalism secures the freedom of the individual.”

#### Congress holding the line on transportation centralization now – it’s the test-case issue for federalism.

Daniel Horowitz, Deputy Political Director at The Madison Project, 3/21/2012, “A Real Solution to the Gridlock Over the Highway Bill,” http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/03/21/a-real-solution-to-the-gridlock-over-the-highway-bill/

With 50 states that are diverse in geography and population, Tom Grave’s devolution bill represents true federalism at work. If we can’t coalesce behind federalism in transportation issues, then what will we ever devolve to the states? Liberals want to maintain federal control over transportation spending to they can implement their social engineering, urban planning, and environmental regulations. It’s time for Republicans to block highway spending from being used as the conduit for the statist agenda.

#### Spills over – preventing federal power key to prevent collapse of federalism.

Jason A. Crook, J.D. Candidate, University of Mississippi, Fall 2008, “Toward a more “perfect” union,” University of Dayton Law Review, pp.77-78

To this end, it may be argued that the best form of government for the United States is that which it originally established-a federal system in which the national government has its enumerated powers and the states have their general ones; a system of government strong enough to meet external challenges yet flexible enough to support internal political diversity. As history has shown, the response to federal encroachment does not lie in secession or nullification but rather through the adjudication of state interests by the Supreme Court. The United States does not have to have a homogenous political culture if it does not want it, but the rising tide of federal power must be hemmed in now if that future is to be avoided. As historian and constitutional scholar Roscoe Ashley poignantly observed in 1913: Whether the effort made in the Federal State to maintain a balance between the national and commonwealth governments will prove to be futile, history will decide. If with the powerful aid given by the strong local spirit in America and a constitution of extreme rigidity, the United States cannot hold in check the forces of centralization, we may well come to the conclusion that Federalism is after all but a transitory phase in the development of centralized States with powerful central governments.

### Federalism DA Shell 2/2

#### Effective US federalism is key to prevent global conflict.

David Bogen, Professor of Law at the University of Maryland School of Law, December 2003, “Slaughter-House Five: Views of the Case,” Hastings Law Journal, p.397.

Finally, American federalism has been a model throughout the world for bringing together diverse peoples under a larger governmental structure. The utility of a national economic policy and a national foreign policy is apparent, but the tug of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds makes this difficult. The breakaway republic of Chechnya in Russia and the fear of separate status for Kurds in Turkey suggest the problems nations may have with significant internal groups with different interests. The lack of autonomy for Tibet gives the Republic of China on Taiwan pause about uniting with the Peoples Republic on the Mainland. If the warning of the anti-federalists comes true, that states cannot maintain their separate sovereignty under a national government, the United States will no longer be the beacon on the hill that gives hope for resolving this kind of international problem. A viable federalism is therefore important, not just for the internal purposes of maximizing popular satisfaction and fostering experimentation, but to demonstrate to a fractious world that dual sovereignty is a viable form of government.

#### That’s the biggest risk of global conflict.

Andreas Wimmer, professor of sociology at the University of California Los Angeles, 2004, “Introduction: Facing Ethnic Conflicts,” *Facing Ethnic Conflicts,* http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/faculty/wimmer/FEC.intro.pdf

The end of the Cold War has brought about a major shift in policy thinking in Western capitals in at least three different ways: First, direct political and military intervention in developing countries now seemed to be a feasible option, since the risk of escalation into a full-scale world war, a threat ever-present as long the nuclear powers watched each other’s moves in every corner of the globe, now ceased to exist. Second, with the virtual defeat of the communist countermodel, Western political and economic doctrines became almost globally valid. Accordingly, Western governments felt responsible to help developing countries and especially the countries of the former Eastern bloc on their way to democracy, legal security, good governance, and market economy. Settling ethnic conflicts was important for achieving a politically stable environment conducive to these reforms. Third, the ethnonationalist wars, especially in the Balkans but also in Iraq, Turkey, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, and elsewhere, triggered a flow of refugees to the West that greatly enhanced the consciousness of living in a unified, interrelated global system. The refugees thus helped to build up the political will for prevention, early action, intervention, and peacemaking and fostered a new discourse of responsibility and morality that complemented the more instrumental power-balance arguments of traditional foreign policy. Seen from a global point of view, the many small-scale wars spreading in the newly independent states of the East or in democratizing societies of the South had replaced the confrontation between East and West as the main threat to global peace and stability— before the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon suddenly shifted the perception of threat, at least in the United States, rather dramatically and gave rise to a new doctrine of prevention and intervention driven by a “homeland security” agenda.

#### Disad turns the case – Federalist system key to effective transportation infrastructure.

Joshua D. Prok, J.D., University of Denver Sturm College of Law, Fall 2008, “Intelligent Transportation Systems: From Hometown Solutions to World Leadership,” Transportation Law Journal, pp.293-4

To acknowledge the pervasive reach of intelligent transportation systems (ITS) technology, both in the U.S. and abroad, this note explores ITS from many levels. Primarily, the federal legal framework calling for development and implementation of ITS at the regional level is described and illustrated. Then, choice of technology and technological adaptation are discussed as methods to alleviate privacy concerns implicated by ITS implementation both in the U.S. and the European Union. Next, challenges to ensuring broader interoperability are contemplated by comparing disputes over the use of transponder technology in the U.S. and the European Union. The discussion concludes with a discussion of the continuing future importance of ITS and the opportunity for the U.S. to lead in making energy efficiency a goal in global ITS development. At the outset, it should be noted that the states spur innovation within the federal framework of the U.S., "serving as laboratories for the development of new social, economic, and political ideas." The Supreme Court has repeatedly made this contention, recognizing that "state innovation is no judicial myth." This spirit of learning from local efforts prompted the exposure of the considerable ITS deployments in the author's home town of Parker, Colorado that follows.

### Uniqueness – US federalism strong now

#### Bond ruling facilitated stronger US federalism.

Nick Dranias, Chair at Goldwater Inst., 3/24/2012, “We Should Accept the Supreme Court’s Invitation to Check and Balance Washington, D.C,” http://libertylawsite.org/2012/03/24/we-should-accept-the-supreme-courts-invitation-to-check-and-balance-washington-d-c/

The implications of Bond for the balance of power between the states and federal government are potentially vast. Bond does not merely reiterate what the Court wrote a decade ago in Alden v. Maine, i.e., that “[t]he States ‘form distinct and independent portions of the supremacy, no more subject, within their respective spheres, to the general authority than the general authority is subject to them, within its own sphere.’”By authorizing citizen lawsuits under the Tenth Amendment for the first time, the Court has finally embraced what Alexander Hamilton wrote more than two hundred years ago in Federalist No. 28—that our Constitution divides power between the states and the federal government so that the people “can make use of the other as the instrument of redress” if “their rights are invaded by either.”

#### New state laws challenge federal over-expansion of authority.

Nick Dranias, Chair at Goldwater Inst., 3/24/2012, “We Should Accept the Supreme Court’s Invitation to Check and Balance Washington, D.C,” http://libertylawsite.org/2012/03/24/we-should-accept-the-supreme-courts-invitation-to-check-and-balance-washington-d-c/

It is time to kick the principles of Bond into higher gear. Already, fourteen states have enacted or adopted the “Health Care Freedom Act” and another seven states have passed the “Firearms Freedom Act.” The Health Care Freedom Act protects individual choice in health plans and insurance against the federal government’s effort to force citizens to buy federally-approved medical insurance beginning in 2014. The Firearms Freedom Act shields in-state firearms manufacturing, possession and sales from being regulated as “interstate commerce” by the federal government’s department of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Both measures are specifically aimed at resisting federal government intrusion into areas formerly reserved to state and local government. Before Bond came down, many scoffed at the idea that states would want to enact such laws, much less that their citizens could actually enforce them under the Tenth Amendment. Now, defenders of health care and firearms freedom acts can point to Bond as authority for liberating states and their citizens from overreaching federal dictates. And they should get the last laugh. Bond sends a strong signal to the federal judiciary that they must once again protect freedom-friendly local laws and policies from being overruled by Congress and distant federal bureaucracies.

#### New bipartisan consensus emerging on federalism.

Jonah Goldberg, syndicated national columnist, 3/20/2012, “Goldberg: To heal government, go local,” LA Times, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/mar/20/opinion/la-oe-goldberg-federalism-20120320

But what if the real compromise isn't in forcing the left and the right to heel? What if instead the solution is to disempower the national elites who think they've got all the answers? Federalism, the process whereby you push most political questions to the lowest democratic level possible — to states, counties, cities, school boards — has been ripe on the right for years. It even had a champion in Texas Gov. Rick Perry, and Rep. Ron Paul (R-Texas) still carries that torch. Federalism is simply the best political system ever conceived of for maximizing human happiness. A one-size-fits-all policy imposed at the national level has the potential to make very large numbers of citizens unhappy, even if it was arrived at democratically. In a pure democracy, I always say, 51% of the people can vote to pee in the cornflakes of 49% of the people. Pushing government decisions down to the lowest democratic level possible — while protecting basic civil rights — guarantees that more people will have a say in how they live their lives. More people will be happy, and the moral legitimacy of political decisions will be greater. The problem for conservative and libertarian federalists is that whenever we talk about federalism, the left hears "states' rights," which is then immediately, and unfairly, translated into "bring back Bull Connor." But that may be changing. In an essay for the spring issue of Democracy Journal, Yale law professor Heather K. Gerken offers the case for "A New Progressive Federalism." Her chief concern is how to empower "minorities and dissenters." Not surprisingly, she defines such people in almost purely left-wing terms of race and sexual orientation. Still, she makes the very compelling point that the current understanding of diversity — including minorities as tokens of inclusion — pretty much guarantees that racial minorities will always be political minorities as well.

### Uniqueness – AT: Obama legislation hurt federalism

#### Obama legislation hasn’t undermined federalism.

Gillian E. Metzger, Professor of Law, Columbia Law School, November 2011, “Federalism Under Obama,” William & Mary Law Review, pp.569-570

Rather than assertions of federal power at the expense of the states, the central dynamic evident under the Obama administration to date is more active government, at both the national and state level. States are given significant room to shape their participation in the new federal initiatives, as well as enhanced regulatory authority and expanded resources to do so. States that are eager to play a greater regulatory role and support the new federal policies therefore have much to gain. But states that choose to stay on the sidelines face the prospect of direct federal intervention or loss of access to substantial federal funds, and their ability to pursue their preferred regulatory (or deregulatory) strategies may be curtailed. Put differently, federalism under the Obama administration is federalism in service of progressive policy, not a general devolution of power and resources to the states. Some might dispute that granting states a role to play in advancing a policy agenda emanating from Washington represents federalism at all. At a minimum, the Obama administration experience puts front and center the debate over whether federalism has any principled, apolitical basis or is instead simply invoked when it serves to advance a favored political result. Yet this experience also suggests that, even in areas in which the national government has constitutional authority to set policy and federalism operates at best as a second-order concern, the result can still be substantial and potentially lasting protection of state authority.

#### Recent legislation hasn’t hurt state power – upholds critical state-level participation.

Gillian E. Metzger, Professor of Law, Columbia Law School, November 2011, “Federalism Under Obama,” William & Mary Law Review, pp.603-604

Whatever the reason, the central roles the states play mean that portraying these new federal measures as a zero-sum contest that the national government won and the states lost is false. Several scholars have argued that conceptualizing federalism in zero-sum terms, with the states and the federal government fighting over who gets to exercise authority in any given area, fundamentally misunderstands the overlapping and negotiated character of contemporary federal-state relations. The recent initiatives demonstrate this point, as their central characteristic is expanded authority at both the national and state levels. For many states the measures are empowering, granting them the authority and resources they need to undertake more effective reform and more aggressive enforcement. Perhaps as important, the imposition of minimum federal requirements protects states from having their regulatory initiatives undermined by interstate mobility and other states' more limited oversight. Undoubtedly, for those states that would prefer not to participate in the new federal initiatives, such as states that oppose the Medicaid expansion or assessing teachers based on student performance, the story is quite different. But the constraints these states feel is more a result of their disagreement with the administration's substantive policies and their reluctance to assume the new governance responsibilities being offered than an inherent characterization of these initiatives as assertions of national power

#### Health care legislation hasn’t undermined federalism.

Patrick Leahy, Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, 5/14/2012, “On Senate Floor,” http://www.leahy.senate.gov/press/press\_releases/release/?id=f4da8848-e517-4b54-93a0-fe9d93c1a683

Even though this law easily meets the tests established by the Supreme Court’s own precedent on the limits of the Commerce Clause, partisan opponents of President Obama want judges to override these legislative decisions properly made by Congress, the elected representatives of the American people. They want to challenge the wisdom understood by generations of Supreme Court justices from the great Chief Justice John Marshall in upholding the constitutionality of the national bank nearly 200 years ago to Justice Cardozo in finding Social Security constitutional early in the last century. The outlandish examples of hypothetical laws that Congress has not passed reduce these matters to ridiculous absurdities. That may be popular in Federalist Society circles and on political blogs, but have no place in the Supreme Court’s determination. There may come a time when Congress passes a law that is law at the edge of its authority, when the boundary of what should be seen as affecting commerce needs to be more closely considered. This is not that case. The Affordable Care Act is squarely within longstanding constitutional lawmaking to deal with an important national problem.

### Link – Transportation Investments

#### New federal transportation investments undermine federalism.

Samuel R. Staley. director of urban and land-use policy at the Reason Foundation, 9/2/2010, “Highways and Federalism,” National Review Online, http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/245552/highways-and-federalism-samuel-r-staley#

The lesson? Transportation is increasingly a state function and not a national one. A second stimulus is likely to serve as political cover for a further centralization of transportation finance and policy when the data are showing more clearly than ever that we need to decentralize policy and authority to the governments that have the most knowledge and understanding of their particular transportation challenges: the states.

#### Federal investments in transportation infrastructure undermine federalism.

Jason A. Crook, J.D. Candidate, University of Mississippi, Fall 2008, “Toward a more “perfect” union,” University of Dayton Law Review, p.77

The decline of the original constitutional relationship between the states and the federal government has in some ways merely been the unavoidable result of a modernizing world. However, as the rise of federal supremacy during the Twentieth Century has revealed, the ability of the federal government to achieve desired policy results through financial grants-in-aid or the ever-popular unfunded mandate has created a carrot-or-the-stick incentive plan in which the states must increasingly adhere to the federal viewpoint or risk the loss of funding necessary to meet their annual budgets. You want a new highway? Set the alcohol limit at . Need a new sewer treatment plant? Impose these regulations. While the constitution guarantees to each state a republican form of government, it does not guarantee the avoidance of impoverishment.

#### Federal direction of infrastructure investments undermines federalism.

Neil S. Siegel, Assistant Professor of Law and Political Science, Duke University School of Law, 2006, “Commandeering and Its Alternatives: A Federalism Perspective,” Vanderbilt Law Review, p.1657

There does not seem to be much difference between conditional spending and commandeering in terms of regulatory control. This is because under conditional spending the federal government gives the money in exchange for the states’ agreement to be commandeered. A difference exists only to the extent one views state choices between the money and the commandeering as itself an exercise of regulatory control. Moving beyond the commandeering context and considering conditional grants in general, the degree of state regulatory control depends on the specificity with which Congress sets the conditions. Conditions can be general and leave great flexibility (for example, “set a reasonable speed limit”), or they can be specific (for example, “set a 55 mph speed limit”). The amount of regulatory control retained by states depends on the type of condition established. Overall, the relative impact of conditional spending from a federalism perspective depends on context, and it would be perilous to attempt a rank ordering of different forms of federal regulation according to their impact on federalism values. Based on the foregoing analysis of the conditional spending power, the most that can be said in general is that the Court has shown too much concern about accountability in the commandeering context and arguably too little concern about accountability when federal regulation takes the form of conditional spending. In addition, the Court has undermined federalism values by paying essentially no attention to the relative impact of different forms of federal regulation on state budgets and decision making capabilities. Thus, the Court’s general categories distinguishing permissible from impermissible kinds of federal legislation do not withstand a functional analysis grounded in the values typically associated with federalism.

### Link – Federal Spending

#### New federal spending undermines federalism.

Chris Edwards, editor of the Cato Institute's Downsizing Government.org, 2/10/2011, “Cutting Spending to Revive Federalism,” National Review Online, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/cutting-spending-revive-federalism

The GOP needs a larger vision to guide their reforms. Republicans need to communicate to the public how a smaller government would benefit America and what federal agencies and activities are damaging and counterproductive. A key part of this strategy should be to revive a central theme of the 1981 and 1995 budget-cutting drives — getting the federal government out of what are properly state and local activities. Constitutional federalism has taken a beating as federal aid to the states has doubled over the last decade to $646 billion this year. This aid goes to public housing, community development, urban transit, and hundreds of other local activities.

#### Federal aid to the states doesn’t solve the link – makes states subservient to central government.

Chris Edwards, editor of the Cato Institute's Downsizing Government.org, 2/10/2011, “Cutting Spending to Revive Federalism,” National Review Online, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/cutting-spending-revive-federalism

Reagan pushed hard to cut state aid. He argued in a 1987 executive order that "federalism is rooted in the knowledge that our political liberties are best assured by limiting the size and scope of the national government." Our liberties are imperiled by the explosive growth in federal aid because the aid is turning the states into little more than regional subdivisions of an all-powerful national government.

#### Federal aid to states undermines federalism.

Chris Edwards, editor of the Cato Institute's Downsizing Government.org, February 2009, “Fiscal Federalism,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/fiscal-federalism

Yet the system desperately needs to be scaled back. With today's large federal budget deficit and the massive cost increases that face entitlement programs, there is little room in the federal budget for state and local activities. Policymakers need to revive federalism and begin to terminate grant programs. If the aid system was shut down, state governments and the private sector would step in and fund those activities that they thought were worthwhile. But by federalizing state and local activities, we are asking Congress to do the impossible — to efficiently plan for the competing needs of a diverse country of more than 300 million people.

### Internal Link – Federalism is zero-sum

#### Federalism is zero-sum – competition between federal and state action is crucial to an effective system.

A.C. Pritchard and Todd Zywicki, Assistant Professor at the University of Michigan Law School and Assistant Professor at George Mason University School of Law, January 1999, “Constitutions and Spontaneous Orders: A Response to Professor McGinnis,” North Carolina Law Review, pp.538-539.

We agree that federalism and the other structural protections of the Constitution - such as the separation of powers and bicameralism - which fragment and decentralize power, are a necessary condition for liberty. By forcing various government actors to struggle against one another for power, these structural protections raise the cost to government actors of misusing government power to either transfer wealth to special interests or to impose costs on society for their own benefit. When operating as the Framers intended, federalism and the separation of powers pit government actors in a zero-sum game, with the gains of one level or branch of government coming only at the expense of another level or branch. By pitting the states against the federal government and Congress against the President, the Constitution seeks to "contrive the interior structure of the government, as that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places." "Ambition," Madison wrote, was to "counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place."

#### Federal and state power trade-off.

Karl Manheim, Professor of Law at Loyola Law School, December 1998, “Recent Rulings By The Rehnquist Court Have Reignited The Historic Debate Over The Meaning Of The Tenth Amendment,” Los Angeles Lawyer, p.55.

Thus, it appears that the powers of Congress have been narrowed under Lopez but not crippled as they were in the era of dual federalism. Legislative power approximates a zero sum game; as congressional power ebbs, state power grows. Thus Lopez marks a mild resurgence in states' rights. The big jump backward, however, has occurred under a different aspect of the Tenth Amendment.

#### Dual federalism model requires trade-offs – increase in federal power diminishes state power.

James Blumstein, Professor of Law at Vanderbilt University, October 1994, “Federalism and Civil Rights: Complementary and Competing Paradigms,” Vanderbilt Law Review, p.1274.

The dual federalism model assumes that there are non-overlapping spheres of state and federal power. Either a subject matter is within the state sphere because interstate commerce is not involved, or it is within the federal sphere because of its interstate commerce character. Under the dual federalism approach, every expansion of federal power came at the direct expense of state regulatory or taxing authority. This doctrine represented the classical zero sum situation, as far as federal/state power was concerned.

### Internal Link – US federalism gets modeled

#### US federalism gets modeled globally.

Benjamin Sovacool, Adjunct Assistant Professor at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, June 2008, “The Best of Both Worlds: Environmental Federalism and the Need for Federal Action on Renewable Energy and Climate Change,” Stanford Environmental Law Journal, p.406.

Third, other countries continue to model American-style federalism. Germany, the Republic of Austria, Russian Federation, Spain, India, and Nigeria have all based parts of their government structure on American federalism, choosing to decentralize power by adopting constitutions that are more federalist than the ones that they have replaced. The "American experience with ... federalism," writes John Kincaid, "may have useful implications for an emerging federalist revolution worldwide." Mikhail Gorbachev even stated that "the phenomenon of federalism affects the interests of the entire global community." Given such trends, it seems likely that other countries may model American environmental federalism. If this is the case, ensuring that the United States government addresses renewable energy and climate policy at the proper scale becomes even more important for the signal it sends to the world.

#### US federalism gets modeled – Latin America proves.

Jose Antonio Cheibub, Zachary Elkins & Tom Ginsburg, Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Associate Professor of Government, University of Texas at Austin and Professor, University of Chicago Law School, June 2011, “Latin American Presidentialism in Comparative and Historical Perspective,” Texas Law Review, p.1710

To be sure, the U.S. model was only one of several on offer. Latin American elites were fully acquainted with enlightenment thought and drew on eclectic sources, including French and British thought and, notably, the 1812 Constitution of Cadiz, the embodiment of Spanish liberalism. Nevertheless, several features of the U.S. model were particularly attractive. Federalism was the leading example, as it helped accommodate traditions of regional and municipal autonomy within the Spanish empire and served as an attractive model for rural elites fearful of domination by urban centers. Venezuela's 1811 document drew directly and self-consciously on the United States' federal model. Federalist thought was even influential in countries where it was not sustained, such as Chile. As various independent states sought to combine into larger entities, federalism was a natural model. The Central American Federation, which encompassed much of that region from 1823 to 1840, was explicitly federal and drawn from the U.S. model. Gran Colombia, which encompassed the territory of today's Colombia, Venezuela, Panama, and Ecuador from 1819 to 1831, was also a federal republic. Today, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela remain federal states.

#### US federalism gets modeled internationally.

Jeremy Waldron, Professor of Law at Columbia, Summer 1998, “Review and Commentary

Charles L. Black, Jr., A New Birth of Freedom,” Columbia Human Rights Law Review, pp.767-768.

Although he says his subject is human rights law, Professor Black talks almost exclusively about American constitutional law in A New Birth of Freedom. He is interested in the First Amendment guarantee of free speech, the Fourteenth Amendment requirements of equal protection and due process, and the application of these distinctively American materials to the states as the well as federal government and legislature. Why then talk about "human rights"? Professor Black does not explain, but I believe the choice is deliberate and justified. He wants us to view the American rights tradition as something which is historically continuous with, and a continuing of inspiration for, the human rights movement generally in the world. That is certainly how others view our constitutional law: we may treat the international instruments with studied indifference, but people in other countries do not ignore the jurisprudence of American constitutional rights. I do not just mean that they are interested in how we understand "free speech" or how U.S. courts define "unreasonable searches and seizures." I mean that they are interested in the whole apparatus of American constitutional rights, federalism, and judicial review, for increasingly this is regarded no longer as an anomaly but as a global model for democratization. Moreover, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are not just pieces of American positive law. They were drafted and ratified at a time of intense philosophical ferment and cross-fertilization between the United States and Europe, and it is fatuous to think that one can understand their framing without considering, for example, the philosophical traffic on the Paris-Philadelphia shuttle at the time. Today their influence is greater than ever: the regard in which the United States is held in the world, Professor Black insists, is due not just to our wealth or military power--that is the regard that is due to a bully --but to the influence of the particular way in which we have embodied a commitment to human rights in the foundations of our system of government.

### Federalism DA Turns the Case

#### DA turns the case – separation of federal/state powers key to effective enforcement.

Chris Edwards, editor of the Cato Institute's Downsizing Government.org, 2/10/2011, “Cutting Spending to Revive Federalism,” National Review Online, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/cutting-spending-revive-federalism

The three levels of government would work better if they resembled a tidy layer cake with separate functions, rather than a marble cake with jumbled lines of responsibility. The failure of our marble-cake government was evident in the disastrous lead-up to, and aftermath of, Hurricane Katrina.

#### Federal role in transportation inhibits state reform and improvement.

Daniel Horowitz, Deputy Political Director at The Madison Project, 3/21/2012, “A Real Solution to the Gridlock Over the Highway Bill,” http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/03/21/a-real-solution-to-the-gridlock-over-the-highway-bill/

Moreover, the fact that Washington gridlock is able to encumber the majority of transportation projects for 50 states just serves to underscore the reason why we should devolve transportation spending to the states. Since the completion of the Interstate Highway System in 1992, there is simply no reason why states shouldn’t levy their own taxes and manage their own highway projects, leaving the few projects with national scope to the federal government. If a state wants to fund public transportation, then let them have the debate about higher gasoline taxes on a local level. At present, there are 28 donor states – states that contribute more money than they receive in transportation funding. This is utter nonsense.

#### Federal investments get misused – state-level transportation policy key to solve.

Tom Graves, U.S. Representative, 2/17/2012, “Highway Robbery – Why Power on Transportation Issues Should Be Restored to the States,” American Legislator, http://www.americanlegislator.org/2012/02/highway-robbery-why-power-on-transportation-issues-should-be-restored-to-the-states/

I believe the federal government has mishandled our gas-tax revenues and mistreated our states. A big pile of money in Washington is like flypaper for political agendas, lobbyists, special interests, and earmarks. The Highway Trust Fund is no exception, and it’s being drained for projects that have absolutely nothing to do with highways. In fact, according to the Heritage Foundation, 2009 saw about 38 percent of our highway funding going to non-highway projects.

### Impact – Democracy

#### Federalism is the best model for democracy and preventing ethnic conflict

Nicole Herther-Spiro, Executive Managing Editor of the Emory International Law Review, “Can ethnic federalism prevent “recourse to rebellion?” A comparative analysis of the Ethiopian and Iraqi constitutional structures,” Spring 2007, Emory International Law Review, p. 371.

By establishing a federal system which provides for real power-sharing among the different groups within a country, that country may successfully resist the detrimental effects of an overly strong and abusive central government. Although thus far Ethiopia has not succeeded in creating a healthy state under its version of ethnic federalism, and Iraq continues to be torn apart by internal strife, there remains some hope for each country. No country entered this world without internal rifts and struggles. While identity-based federalism may not create a country that exemplifies the Western model of liberal democratic ideals, it may enable a country to hold itself together in the face of deep internal divisions and painfully abusive histories, and provide a good measure of liberal, representative democracy in the process.

#### Global democracy key to prevent extinction.

Larry Diamond, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, , http://www.wilsoncenter.org/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm.

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

#### Federalism key to democracy – boosts legitimacy of government among all parties.

Larry Diamond, Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institute, February 12, 2004, Why Decentralize Power in a Democracy? http://www.stanford.edu/~ldiamond/iraq/Decentralize\_Power021204.htm.

Second, federalism or devolution of power is adopted as a means of sharing power among lots of different political parties, which may or may not have some basis in ethnic or regional ties. If democracy is to survive, it cannot be a winner-take-all system, particularly not one in which one party is always going to win, and thus take all. When some governing responsibilities and resources are devolved to lower levels of authority, and when there are a lot of different provinces and municipalities whose governments will be chosen through elections, parties and groups that cannot win control of the central government may win the opportunity to exercise power in some of the lower-level governments This increases their confidence in and commitment to the political system, and the sense among citizens generally that the system is fair and inclusive. If groups with strong bases of support in the country are completely and indefinitely excluded from any share of political power at any level, they are likely to question and even challenge the legitimacy of the system.

### Impact – Economy

#### Federalism key to revive US growth.

Bruce Katz, Vice President and Director of the Metropolitan Policy Program, Global Cities Initiative, 3/18/2012, “Will the Next President Remake Federalism?” http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2012/03/18-federalism-katz

Federalism is not a gift that Washington bestows on statehouses and city halls. Rather, it is a special, often dormant vehicle for galvanizing and unleashing the talents and energies of an entrepreneurial nation. The next president has a historic opportunity to usher in a new era of pragmatic, collaborative federalism that capitalizes on the economic power of metropolitan areas and the policy creativity of state and local leaders. Remaking federalism is the path toward an economy that is productive, sustainable and inclusive. More broadly, it can be a vehicle for economic prosperity, fiscal solvency and political comity - if the next president is willing to take it.

#### Lack of economic growth causes global war.

Walter Russell Mead, Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2/4/2009, “Only Makes You Stronger,” The New Republic, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2169866/posts

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

#### Federalism key to US economic growth – creates competition for business.

John McGinnis, Professor of Law at the Cardozo School of Law, March 2002, “Reviving Tocqueville's America: The Rehnquist Court's Jurisprudence of Social Discovery,” California Law Review, pp.508-509.

The Constitution left the rest of domestic regulation to the states. Although the states were repositories of enormous and potentially tyrannical powers, the free movement of goods and people among them restrained their ability to use their power at the behest of interest groups to oppress the liberty of or extract wealth from their citizens. If the states exercised their power unwisely, free citizens could take themselves or their capital elsewhere. Thus, the Constitution's strictly enumerated powers restrained the federal government, which in turn restrained the states through the competition that the federal government maintained by keeping open the avenues of trade and investment. Federalism thus limits the government from engaging in excessive regulation and wasteful spending on behalf of interest groups. Some economists today explain that because of these limitations, the original constitutional design of a federalist free-trading system facilitated the United States' steady growth, allowing it to become an economic superpower by the beginning of the twentieth century. But federalism also created spaces for what Tocqueville saw as the distinguishing and sustaining feature of American democracy: the principle of association. This principle nurtures an energy of civic engagement that then could be transmitted throughout the country. A divided and limited government provides space for civil associations of all kinds because it does not take the resources necessary to support them and leaves objectives for people to pursue in common purpose. In contrast, as Tocqueville perceived, a unitary, majoritarian state is more likely to take the requisite resources and treat civil associations badly because they would be the sole barrier between it and absolute power.

### Impact – Conflict

#### Federalism solves global secessionist conflicts.

Steven Calabresi, Associate Professor at the Northwestern University School of Law, December 1995, “A Government of Limited and Enumerated Powers: In Defense of United States v. Lopez,” Michigan Law Review, pp.760-761.

As one surveys the world in 1995, American-style federalism of some kind or another is everywhere triumphant, while the forces of nationalism, although still dangerous, seem to be contained or in retreat. The few remaining highly centralized democratic nation-states like Great Britain, France, and Italy all face serious secessionist or devolutionary crises. Other highly centralized nation-states, like China, also seem ripe for a federalist, as well as a democratic, change. Even many existing federal and confederal entities seem to face serious pressure to devolve power further than they have done so far: thus, Russia, Spain, Canada, and Belgium all have very serious devolutionary or secessionist movements of some kind. Indeed, secessionist pressure has been so great that some federal structures recently have collapsed under its weight, as has happened in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the former Soviet Union. All of this still could be threatened, of course, by a resurgence of nationalism in Russia or elsewhere, but the long-term antinationalist trend seems fairly secure. There is no serious intellectual support for nationalism anywhere in the world today, whereas everywhere people seem interested in exploring new transnational and devolutionary federal forms. The democratic revolution that was launched in Philadelphia in 1776 has won, and now it seems that democrats everywhere join Madison in "cherishing the spirit and supporting the character of federalists."

#### Federalism solves war.

Bill Flax, contributor to Forbes, 10/20/2011, “Europe's Debt Crisis Is No Failing Of Federalism,” Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/billflax/2011/10/20/europes-debt-crisis-is-no-failing-of-federalism/

When thirteen several and sovereign states united to establish a general government, they surrendered only specific functions. James Madison, “Father” of the Constitution, explained, “The powers delegated . . . to the federal government, are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce.” Domestically, what became Washington D.C. was primarily to ensure states didn’t wage war or assert tariffs against one another. The federal and state authorities became offsetting buttresses repelling any despotic aspirations the other might exhibit. Federalism prevented the incessant conflicts plaguing Eurasia and the dysfunction bedeviling Latin America. Other than our horrific Civil War, leaving most government to local peculiarities bred peace.

#### Federalism solves global conflict – empirically proven.

Leslie H. Gelb, former New York Times columnist and senior government official, 1/1/2012, “Leslie H. Gelb on How to Save Iraq,” Newsweek, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2012/01/01/leslie-h-gelb-on-how-to-save-iraq.html

Federalism preserved the peace for Bosnia reached at Dayton. Serbs, Muslims, and Croats were allowed mostly to run their own affairs, and even, until a few years ago, keep their own armies. Switzerland, Belgium, Spain, and the United Arab Emirates have remained whole and peaceful by the same means. And don’t forget that our own United States could have been created only on this basis. The 13 original states joined the union only on the constitutional guarantee that they could run most of their own affairs. Washington didn’t take on its present powers until Franklin Roosevelt’s presidency, 150 years later.

### Impact – Counter-terrorism

#### Failure to uphold federalism trades off with counter-terrorism.

Chris Edwards, editor of the Cato Institute's Downsizing Government.org, February 2009, “Fiscal Federalism,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/fiscal-federalism

5. Grants cause policymaking overload. A serious problem caused by the huge scope of federal grant activity is that federal politicians spend their time dealing with local issues, such as public schooling, rather than crucial national issues. The huge array of grant programs generates endless opportunities for federal politicians to earmark projects for their home districts, in a chase for funding that consumes much of their time. Each new aid program has stretched thinner the ability of policymakers to deal with truly national problems because local spending issues divert their attention. Grants have helped create an "overload" on federal decisionmaking capability. It is hard to quantify this problem, but it is clear that most federal policymakers ignore important national problems, such as they did the increasing threat of terrorism before 9/11. Even after 9/11, a number of investigations have revealed that most members of the House and Senate intelligence committees do not bother, or do not have time, to read crucial intelligence reports.President Calvin Coolidge was right in 1925 when he argued that aid to the states should be cut because it was "encumbering the national government beyond its wisdom to comprehend, or its ability to administer" its proper roles.

#### High risk of terrorism in the status quo – experts agree.

Greg Miller, staff writer and head of the intelligence beat, 5/17/2012, “Counterterrorism expert sees much to be done,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/counterterrorism-expert-sees-much-to-be-done/2012/05/17/gIQAtPcFXU\_story.html

Andrew Liepman, who is stepping down Friday as deputy director of the National Counterterrorism Center, has spent much of his tenure monitoring a near-constant stream of threats, including the latest al-Qaeda plot to blow up an airplane with an underwear bomb. But as his six-year stint winds down, Liepman has increasingly sought to look past the latest threat data at longer-term questions, including what and how long it will take for the conflict with al-Qaeda to end. Al-Qaeda’s core organization in Pakistan was staggered last year by the death of Osama bin Laden and the toll of CIA drone strikes. But in an interview, Liepman said that predictions of al-Qaeda’s demise seem increasingly premature. “The mission hasn’t been accomplished, al-Qaeda hasn’t been strategically defeated,” Liepman said. “We’ll be done when the bin Laden global jihadist ideology no longer resonates at all. “I think we’re a ways away from that,” he said.

#### Terrorism causes nuclear war.

Patrick F. Speice, Jr., JD Candidate at Marshall-Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary, February 2006, “Negligence and Nuclear Nonproliferation: Eliminating the Current Liability Barrier to Bilateral US-Russian Nonproliferation Assistance Programs,” William & Mary Law Review, pp.1439-1440

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states, as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons.

### Impact – Africa

#### Federalism key to African stability – solves power-sharing.

Constant Brand, writer for the Associated Press, 3/3/2005, “Leaders advocate federal model to solve conflicts in Iraq, Cyprus, Sudan ,” Sudan Tribune, http://www.sudantribune.com/article.php3?id\_article=8334

Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt said federalism could promote peace and stability, especially in the Middle East and Africa. "The facts prove that it is definitely the right way to prevent conflicts, whether between cultures, languages, or religions," Verhofstadt said at the conference, the third of its kind since 1999. Bilingual Belgium’s Francophone and Dutch-speaking populations share power, and Verhofstadt said that model could be useful for Iraq as it drafts its new constitution. He recommended that the new government be a federal one, with regional governments run by Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds. "It won’t be easy at all, for Iraq has various languages, ethnic groups and religions," he said, and whether such a system could offer enough autonomy must be studied. "It could be a way to achieve the so much-needed stability that is lacking today," he said. "It’s a solution, a way to respect diversity," said Canadian Intergovernmental Affairs Minister Lucienne Robillard, adding that Canada was looking into whether it could help draft an Iraqi constitution. "For Sudan, too, it’s a solution." Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo, who currently holds the presidency of the African Union, said federalism offered African nations like his a way to provide rights and powers to minorities. "With over 350 languages and even more dialects, Nigerians feel they are respected and represented at the center," Obasanjo told the conference.

#### African conflicts escalate – causes major power conflict.

Muzaffer Ercan Yilmaz, Ph.D., Balikesir University, Bandirma Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty, Department of International Relations, Winter 2008, “The New World Order”: An Outline of the Post-Cold War Era,” Alternatives, http://www.alternativesjournal.net/volume7/Number4/myilmaz.pdf

Despite contrary expectations, however, a fresh cycle of ethnopolitical movements have re-emerged recently in Eastern Europe (including the Balkans), Central Asia, Africa, and many other parts of the world. While wars fought among sovereign countries are increasingly the exception to the norm, intra-national conflicts have account for over 90 percent of the major armed conflicts recorded in recent years worldwide. This trend appears to be holding. Yet the international community cannot be said to have well prepared to this trend. Major international organizations, including the United Nations, were designed to cope with inter-state problems, historically the main source of threat to global peace and security. Besides, the fact that internal conflicts occur within the borders of states made major international actors reluctant to intervene, either for legal concerns or for concern to avoid probable loses. For example, during Clinton administration, the United States government issued PDD-25 (Presidential Decision Directive-25), limiting the conditions that the United States can participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations. In short, unless they really escalate, the international community has preferred not to involve in intra-national conflicts. But such conflicts could be as serious, costly, and intense as any in the past. And somehow they need to be resolved, or else international peace and security will not be in a stable situation. Although intra-state conflicts appear to be local, they can quickly gain an international dimension due to global interdependence and to various international supports. In fact, when external parties provide political, economic, or military assistance, or asylum and bases for actors involved in local struggles, these conflicts inevitably assume an international dimension.

#### Their evidence doesn’t apply – failures of federalism only reflect implementation.

R.T. Akinyele, Department of History at the University of Lagos, 2000, Africa Development, p.218.

The three countries under study have experimented with federalism, which is widely accepted as the most efficacious instrument for assuring self-rule and shared rule in a multi-ethnic State (Schmitt 1996:21). Yet, the outcome has been less than satisfactory. This, itself, can be attributed to distortions in the operation of the federal arrangement. Nigeria, by conservative estimate, has about 250 ethnic or linguistic groups in a geographical area of 913,072.89 square kilometers. But the irony of the situation, as E.A. Afigbo (1991:14) argued, is that the federal structure adopted in 1954 did not reflect the cultural or geographical diversities of the country. It was reflective of the administrative systems of the colonial period.

### Impact – Afghanistan

#### Federalism is key to solve Afghani conflict – it’s superior to centralization.

Charles Santos, former United Nations Afghan mediator, March 25, 2002, Insight on the News, p.40.

However, supporting unrepresentative and unacceptable central governments resulted in the U.S. failure in Vietnam and the Soviet failure in Afghanistan. What is needed in Afghanistan is establishment of a political system that we long have been familiar with in the United States - federalism. Federalism works particularly well in diverse societies. James Madison made the point [Federalist No. 51] that balance between different communities and religious groups is crucial to ensure the liberty of all. The question for the American federalists was how to develop a structure that could accommodate the multiplicity of diverse interests and groups while preserving unity. In Afghanistan the issues are remarkably similar. Still, the United Nations and the media experts continue to tell us that Afghanistan's salvation is through centralized political structures that seek not balance with the regions and the sharing of power with different ethnic communities, but domination and control. They do not tell us how Afghanistan's diverse communities will be protected or interethnic good will restored. Instead, we are asked to believe in a winner-take-all model that has been tried over and over again in Afghanistan - and which has failed time and again.

#### Continued conflict in Afghanistan escalates to superpower nuclear conflict.

S. Frederick Starr, Chairman of the Central Asia-Caucasus Institute at Johns Hopkins University, December 13, 2001, “The War against terrorism and US bilateral relations with the nations of Central Asia,” Testimony before the US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus, http://www.cacianalyst.org/Publications/Starr\_Testimony.htm

The Central Asians face a similar danger with respect to our efforts in Afghanistan. Some Americans hold that we should destroy Bin Laden, Al Queda, and the Taliban and then leave the post-war stabilization and reconstruction to others. Such a course runs the danger of condemning all Central Asia to further waves of instability from the South. But in the next round it will not only be Russia that is tempted to throw its weight around in the region but possibly China, or even Iran or India. All have as much right to claim Central Asia as their backyard as Russia has had until now. Central Asia may be a distant region but when these nuclear powers begin bumping heads there it will create terrifying threats to world peace that the U.S. cannot ignore.

#### Centralization is the root cause of Aghani conflict.

Charles Santos, former United Nations Afghan mediator, March 25, 2002, Insight on the News, p.40.

During my 12 years of experience, from the late eighties to the late nineties, trying to end the civil war in Afghanistan, it became clear that the failure to resolve the conflict was directly attributable to attempts to restore outmoded notions of centralized state power in that nation. For the last 30 years Afghanistan's central government has operated by repression and terror, particularly against various ethnic communities. Yet today we brand the indigenous and natural trend toward regional administration and local authority as worrisome and destabilizing, without seeing it in its historical and ethnic context. Recall, for example, that residents in Paktia province in early February took up arms against the regime in Kabul, which had imposed upon it a governor. Following this incident experts such as U.N. adviser Barry Rubin and Pakistani journalist Ahmed Rashid, author of the widely quoted book, The Taliban, told us we needed to send thousands more troops to expand the control of the central government. Some experts, including S. Frederick Starr and Marin Strmecki, argue for the reinstatement of Pashtun royalists, who have been holed up in Rome for the last 30 years. Others, including Rubin and Rashid, argue for U.S. support of a new regime led by Pashtun leader Hamid Karzai. Unfortunately, the argument has been framed in terms of the merits of individual leaders instead of the power dynamics of the ethnic communities and regions they represent. Their definition of the problem is the problem. And their solution, the unbalanced imposition of central control throughout the country, suggests that they have been co-opted by the very factionalism they decry. The result will lead only to further instability and civil war.

### Impact – Iraq

#### Federalism key to prevent inevitable Iraqi conflict escalation.

Leslie H. Gelb, former New York Times columnist and senior government official, 1/1/2012, “Leslie H. Gelb on How to Save Iraq,” Newsweek, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2012/01/01/leslie-h-gelb-on-how-to-save-iraq.html

In early 2006, then-senator Joe Biden and I discussed Iraq for three unbothered hours while our shuttle to Washington idled on the LaGuardia tarmac. We agreed that without an internal political solution, Iraq would sooner or later tumble into bloody civil war. Too many Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds just simply hated each other. And we agreed that only one political plan stood a chance of working—federalism. Federalism is not partition. It is the tried and true means of allowing peoples who don’t trust each other to live together in one country by decentralizing power. Today federalism remains Iraq’s only hope for peace.

#### Instability escalating now – high risk of collapse and terrorism.

Journal of Turkish Weekly, 2/10/2012, “Escalation of Crisis in Iraq, What is Next?” http://www.turkishweekly.net/op-ed/2939/-escalation-of-crisis-in-iraq-what-is-next-.html

To sum up, whatever the main reason presumed for tension and increased attacks, political climate of extreme divisions and uncertainty have escalated across Iraq and have threatened stability. If the recent political turbulence does not calm down, it is possible that the Sunni militant groups with the affiliation of Al-Qaeda carry out sophisticated sensational attacks. It may also lead to the Kurds separating from the central government and declaring an independent Kurdistan.

#### Centralization fails – only federalism solves Iraqi conflict.

Leslie H. Gelb, former New York Times columnist and senior government official, 1/1/2012, “Leslie H. Gelb on How to Save Iraq,” Newsweek, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2012/01/01/leslie-h-gelb-on-how-to-save-iraq.html

The idea behind federalism is to keep Iraq united by decentralizing power on a regional basis. This would provide each ethno-religious group the authority to run its own regional affairs, while the central government tends to national interests. The first step would be to establish semiautonomous regions or states with power to make and administer their own laws and provide for internal security. Thereby, Kurds and Sunnis would be protected from Shiite-imposed rule. Cities with mixed religious populations could be governed as federal cities under international protection. The central government would conduct foreign affairs, create a national army to guard borders, and manage oil production and revenues. Revenues would be distributed according to each group’s percentage of the total population. Thus Sunni Arabs would be guaranteed 20 percent of revenues even though their region has far less than 20 percent of the country’s oil. Of course, whether and how to advance the federal formula would be left up to Iraqis. To those who see this as a radical approach: look at Iraq’s Constitution. It provides for such a federal structure, but requires some spelling out of details. The main sticking point at present is the Shiite insistence of running the whole country from Baghdad. Shiites are right about one thing—it is critical to keep Iraq whole. Otherwise it would become prey to neighbors like Iran or the scene of endless civil war. But the Shiites are dead wrong about being able to achieve unity by centralized “power sharing” in Baghdad. That’s been the approach since Americans took charge, and it hasn’t worked for two reasons: Shiites never really share power. And power remains concentrated in Baghdad.

### Impact – Libya

#### Federalism key to prevent new Libyan conflict.

Ranj Alaaldin, senior analyst at the Next Century Foundation, 3/28/2012, “Libya should embrace federalism,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/mar/28/libya-federalism-regions-revolution

That, of course, assumes Libya will go on to progress, and avoid regression, after the democratic process is started in June when a 200-member national assembly will be elected to draft the new constitution. The competition for a stake in the future of the country may not be underpinned by widespread violence or civil war but the potential for it is there and could be amplified when competing groups jostle for positions of power, like control of the military. The military was feared and, therefore, deliberately kept weak by Gaddafi himself, as a means of preserving his control. If and when new Libya decides to have a decent national army, powerful enough to impose law and order and rein in any militias, challenges will begin to arise over who or what group heads it since many will fear its personalisation by leading groups and use against rivals. Fundamentally, Libya has avoided civil war because the militias are the supreme authority; in other words, they are yet to be challenged by a respectable force and it remains to be seen whether they will back down in the event their interests are undermined by an equally superior opponent. If the army is to remain weak and the militias are kept intact, then they should be integrated into a representative and proper power-sharing mechanism: federalism. In other words, sustain their current military control but as part of a regulated framework underpinned by dispute-resolution mechanisms and one that makes them more organised, efficient and accountable forces able to not just protect their local regions but also Libya's borders.

#### Libyan escalation causes proliferation, terrorism and regional escalation.

Jason Pack and Barak Barfi, president of Libya-Analysis.com and research fellow with the New America Foundation, February 2012, “In War’s Wake: The Struggle for Post-Qadhafi Libya,” http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus118.pdf

Regarding counterterrorism: Libya would pose a greater proliferation risk than other Arab Spring countries—with the possible exception of Yemen—if it became a failed state. The likelihood of a dysfunctional Libya becoming a safe haven for al-Qaeda or Salafi jihadists is quite small. That said, Qadhafi created dense linkages with the Tuareg tribes of Mali and Niger, and many of these tribes have become increasingly connected to arms smuggling by al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). The ramifications of this are already being felt—with Tripoli weak and unable to control the borders, arms smugglers have trafficked MANPADS from Libya to destinations as far as Cote d’Ivoire. In addition, the vast flow of Libyan heavy weapons into Mali has sparked a northern Tuareg uprising against the government of Amadou Toumani Touré in Bamako. Recent reports indicate that the Malian rebels are veterans of Qadhafi’s armed forces and that they are led by a Libyan commander.Although Touré has claimed that his opponents are linked with AQIM, most evidence suggests that they are not. Nonetheless, these current events illustrate how interconnected the Saharan region is. If Libya were to become a failed state, it would rapidly destabilize all regional states by largely strengthening peripheral movements against incumbent governments. Moreover, if moderate Islamist elements are not incorporated into the government, and if the periphery remains distrustful of and disconnected from the central authorities, then Libya’s widespread support for peaceful Islamism and its gratitude toward the West for toppling Qadhafi could soon turn into sympathy for anti-Western jihadism.

#### Federalism key to Libyan stability.

Ranj Alaaldin, senior analyst at the Next Century Foundation, 3/28/2012, “Libya should embrace federalism,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/mar/28/libya-federalism-regions-revolution

The move toward federalism is controversial but Libyans should embrace it. The concept is a sensitive one largely because it has become synonymous with partition. The contrary is true though. What federalism ultimately means for Libya is less power for the capital and, therefore, a series of benefits that in the long term will protect the interests of the population. These include preserving Libya's territorial integrity and the harmony of its people, since federalism will ultimately be about the division of power rather than, for example, the division of competing ethnic and ideological groups. The decentralisation that federalism promotes is one that Libyans have been embracing and to which they owe the success of their revolution, given the loose structure that the uprising took shape over the course of nine-months.

### Impact – Russia

#### Russian federalism key to democracy, regional stability, and accidental nuclear launch.

Gordon M. Hahn, visiting research scholar with the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, Summer 2003, “The past, present, and future of the Russian federal state,” Demokratizatsiya, p.343.

Where did Russia's federal state come from, where has it been, where is it going, and why does it matter beyond a small circle of Russia specialists? Taking the last question first, the success or failure of Russia's transformation into a stable market democracy will determine the degree of stability throughout Eurasia. For such a large multinational state, successful political and economic development depends on building an efficient democratic federal system. Indeed, one of the main institutional factors leading to the demise of the Soviet partocratic regime and state was the considerably noninstitutionalized status of the RSFSR (Russian Republic) in the Soviet Union's pseudofederal, national-territorial administrative structure. Only a democratic federal system can hold together and effectively manage Russia's vast territory, the awkward administrative structure inherited from the failed USSR, and hundreds of divergent ethnic, linguistic, and religious interests. Dissolution or even any further weakening of Russia's federal state could have dire consequences for Russian national and international security by weakening control over its means of mass destruction.

#### Successful Russian federalism key to prevent proliferation and nuclear federalism.

Gordon M. Hahn, visiting research scholar with the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, Summer 2003, “The past, present, and future of the Russian federal state,” Demokratizatsiya, pp.360.361.

Growing tension in Russian-Muslim relations and the federation's weakness or collapse would have grave international security implications. On the most obvious level, the fate of Russian federalism touches on the political stability and integrity of a nuclear power. But it also impinges on issues such as the successful integration of a stable, prosperous, and democratic Russia into Western and other international economic and security structures; the threat of Islamic terrorism; and the proliferation of weapons and other means of mass destruction. Russia is vulnerable to illegal as well as legal infiltration of Islamists from abroad. The titular Muslim republics border on and/or maintain close business, educational, and cultural ties to Chechnya, the Transcaucasus, and Central Asian states. Russia's own borders are extremely porous. Thus, these republics are subject to infiltration by and lending support to revolutionary Islamists from Muslim and Arab states. On 28 June Russia's Federal Migration Service reported that Russia is now a major transit corridor for illegal international migration and hosts from 1.5 to 5 million illegal immigrants. With Wahabbi infiltration among Russia's Muslims, Putin's support for the U.S.-led war against terror, and the pressure that federative reforms are putting on federal-regional and Russian-Muslim relations, Russia is less stable and provides more fertile ground for the support of Islamic terror. A small number of militants can cause great havoc. It is well known that Russian sites holding nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and materials are far from fully secure. There have been several attempts to penetrate such sites and seize weapons or materials. Several years ago, Chechens claimed responsibility for leaving a small quantity of nuclear-grade uranium in several Moscow parks. In April 2002 a team of journalists made their way into a high-security zone near a nuclear material warehouse to highlight lax security. In mid-June, a resident of Tatarstan was detained carrying two kilograms of uranium in the upper Volga republic of Udmurtia.

#### Lack of Russian federalism causes fragmentation and use of force.

Igor Torbakov, Senior Researcher at the Finnish Institute of International Affairs, 2/8/2012, “Russia: Looking at Putin’s Nationalist Dilemma,” http://www.eurasianet.org/node/64975/?cid=oth\_partner\_site-atlantic%22

So long as genuine federalism in the Russian Federation remains absent, the state will be, in its essence, an imperial entity. Such a "mini-empire" as some commentators have called it can be ruled only undemocratically, with an unyielding Kremlin needed to keep both Russian ethnic nationalism and other ethnic nationalisms in check. Putin has lashed out against the slogan "Russia for the Russians" and has warned that any attempts to set up region-based political parties will not be permitted. Such statements indicate that force will be necessary to maintain his vision of a "unique Russian civilization." But how forceful can Putin be, if a large number of nationalists, perhaps a majority, are not behind him?

### AT: Impact Turn – Environment

#### Federalism spurs competition between states – causes better forms of regulation.

John McGinnis, Professor of Law at the Cardozo School of Law, March 2002, “Reviving Tocqueville's America: The Rehnquist Court's Jurisprudence of Social Discovery,” California Law Review, pp. 509-510.

Federalism not only sustains civil associations, its very structure builds into political life some of the advantages of spontaneous order. First, it creates a marketplace in which state governments must compete, much like private associations. By placing state governments in competition with one another, it forces them to be efficient in addressing externalities like pollution or criminal violence within their jurisdictions. As with other forms of spontaneous order, states produce goods (in this case, public goods) to address the problems within their jurisdiction in a manner that efficiently responds to the preferences of their members (in this case, the citizens of their state). Furthermore, because of the spontaneous ordering of competing states, they will readily copy the successful innovations of other states. Here, that means creating a "laboratory of democracy" where the successful experiments of yesterday become the effective public policy of tomorrow. Second, like different associations, different states provide different political niches for a diverse people, responding to different preferences with different goods. Inhabitants of San Francisco simply have different preferences and needs from those in Dubuque, and uniform rules failing to take account of this diversity will leave them alienated from their government. Third, like civil associations, federalism increases civic responsibility. Political scientists have frequently noted that in large governments citizens behave strategically, making it harder to gain agreement on the public goods that will improve the community. Federalism and the related but more encompassing principle of subsidiarity, where states then devolve powers to localities, temper strategic behavior and substitute in its place the genuine concern of one citizen for another.

#### Race to the Bottom theory is wrong – local regulation is better suited to deal with environmental problems.

Henry Butler, Senior Lecturer in Law at Northwestern University School of Law, Spring 2008, “A defense of common law environmentalism: The discovery of better environmental policy,” Case Western Reserve Law Review, p.740.

Much of the condemnation of the common law as a means for protecting the environment is based on a lack of confidence in the ability of states to develop adequate legal rules in the face of interest group pressure to compete in a "race to the bottom." Although state regulations are a major force in environmental regulation, the perceived state government failure has provided the basis for many calls for continued federal domination of environmental policy. In recent years, there has been a growing appreciation of the potential to use federalism and jurisdictional competition as tools in improving environmental regulation. Professor Richard Revesz has argued that most pollution is local, and thus there should be a presumption of decentralized regulation. Similarly, Professors Henry Butler and Jonathan Macey have argued that jurisdictional competition is likely to generate optimal laws if four conditions are fulfilled: (1) the economic entities affected by the law must be able to move to alternative jurisdictions at a relatively low cost; (2) all of the consequences of one jurisdiction's laws must be felt within that jurisdiction; (3) lawmakers must be forced to respond to adverse events such as falling population, real estate prices, market share or revenue, and other manifestations of voter discontent that result from inefficient regulations; and (4) jurisdictions must be able to select any set of laws they desire. Analyzing a particular pollution control problem using these conditions can clarify the optimal level of government to address the problem.

### AT: Impact Turn – Racism

#### Perception of federalism as racist is outdated – states are key sites for progressivism.

Heather Gerken, Professor of Law at Yale Law School, 3/15/2012, “A New Progressive Federalism,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/heather-gerken/a-new-progressive-federal\_b\_1349053.html

But it is a mistake to equate federalism's past with its future. State and local governments have become sites of empowerment for racial minorities and dissenters, the groups that progressives believe have the most to fear from decentralization. In fact, racial minorities and dissenters can wield more electoral power at the local level than they do at the national. And while minorities cannot dictate policy outcomes at the national level, they can rule at the state and local level. Racial minorities and dissenters are using that electoral muscle to protect themselves from marginalization and promote their own agendas.

#### Centralization inhibits progressivism – decentralization key to solve.

Heather Gerken, Professor of Law at Yale Law School, 3/15/2012, “A New Progressive Federalism,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/heather-gerken/a-new-progressive-federal\_b\_1349053.html

Similarly, while the First Amendment has long been thought of as part of the bedrock of our democracy, it does not represent the only tool for furthering dialogue and nurturing dissent. Decentralization gives political outliers one of the most important powers a dissenter can enjoy--the power to force the majority to engage. It thus helps generate the deliberative froth needed to prevent national politics from becoming ossified or frozen by political elites uninterested in debating the hard questions that matter most to everyday voters.

#### Minority-rule at state level key to progressive change.

Heather Gerken, Professor of Law at Yale Law School, 3/15/2012, “A New Progressive Federalism,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/heather-gerken/a-new-progressive-federal\_b\_1349053.html

Minority rule, by contrast, allows racial minorities and dissenters to act as efficacious political actors, just as members of the majority do. Think, for example, about where groups we would normally call a "minority" now actually constitute a majority: a mostly African-American city like Atlanta, a city such as San Francisco where the majority favors same-sex marriage, or a state like California or Texas where Latinos will soon be in the majority. In each of those cases, minority rule--where national minorities constitute local majorities--allows minorities to protect themselves rather than look to courts as their source of solace. It empowers racial minorities and dissenters not by shielding them from the majority, but by turning them into one. Why should we care? We should care because the success of our democracy depends on two projects. The first is integration--ensuring that our fractious polity remains a polity. The second is dialogue--ensuring a healthy amount of debate and disagreement within our democracy. We have made progress on both fronts, but there is a great deal more work to do. Our social, political, and economic life still reflects racial divides. Our political system is immobilized; the issues that matter to everyday citizens are stuck in the frozen political tundra we call Washington. We have long looked to deeply rooted rights as tools for promoting equality and protecting dissent. But everyday politics can be just as important for pursuing these goals. We should look to minority rule, not just minority rights, as we build a better democracy.

## Private CP

### 1NC Private CP Shell

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should fully deregulate and privatize \_\_\_\_\_\_ [Insert whatever area of transportation infrastructure the affirmative invests in. Example: Interstate highways, ports, railroads]

#### The counterplan is net beneficial – it solves the case and avoids the spending disadvantage

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

Government intervened in a developing urban and intercity transportation system that faced different problems than it does today. Regardless of the justification for that intervention, most policymakers, transportation providers, and users have increasingly concluded that the performance of the current system is generally unsatisfactory and that government’s traditional solution (reinforced by classic political pressure from interest groups) of spending our way out of the problems is not a viable option because the federal government and most state governments are facing severe fiscal pressures for the foreseeable future. Privatization and deregulation may appear to be an extreme approach, especially given past problems with private provision of certain transportation services and infrastructure and current doubts about whether markets can be trusted to deliver essential services. At the same time, government failure in transportation has solidified inefficient practices that must be purged and has slowed technological advance that must be accelerated. Private firms may accomplish those goals if they are not constrained by the kinds of regulatory interventions that undermined their initial efforts to develop the system.

#### The counterplan avoids the Politics disadvantage

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

The deep recession that began in late 2007 has significantly reduced the public’s and policymakers’ confidence in markets and undoubtedly made it more difficult politically to privatize and deregulate the transportation sys- tem. Of course, the U.S. economy will eventually grow again for a sustained period, and memories of the recession’s effects will start to fade. In addition several factors suggest it is important to look beyond the current political climate. First, as noted, the problems associated with the transportation system are primarily attributable to government failure, not market failure, and the public has become frustrated with the government’s inability to improve the system. Second, the nation has been searching for the optimal mix of public and private participation in transportation for three centuries, and it is not going to accept the status quo as a long-run equilibrium. Third, political winds shift very quickly, as indicated by the public’s growing concern that the Obama administration’s intervention in the economy may be excessive. Fourth, budgetary pressures have made public officials more receptive to private sector participation in transportation, while the long-term effects of the recession have intensified officials’ interest in private sector innovations in transportation and other areas of the economy that could spur the nation’s growth.

### 1NC Private CP Shell

#### The counterplan solves better – privatization and deregulation ensure higher quality transportation infrastructure by utilizing market forces to spur innovation

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

The essential goal of privatization and deregulation of the U.S. transportation system is to develop market-based institutions that are stimulated by competition to respond to customers’ preferences, expand choices, minimize costs, and introduce innovative services and technologies. Privately owned enterprises selling services directly to the public are dependent on customer goodwill and in contrast to public sector providers less likely to have their operations shaped by special interests that substantially raise the cost of transportation to the general public. The evidence I synthesize in subsequent chapters indicates that the annual efficiency costs associated with public ownership and (mis)management of the system clearly exceed $100 billion, not including the costs of impediments to innovation and slow technological advance. Theoretical and limited empirical arguments suggest that privatization and deregulation could significantly eliminate current inefficiencies and spur innovations that are difficult to envision in the current environment, but the case would be much more persuasive if it were accompanied by evidence obtained from privatization experiments in the United States.

### AT: Permutation – Do Both

#### Any government involvement taints the whole operation – public/private partnerships ensure failure

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 390

Here, Poole advocates Public-Private Partnerships in order to address traffic problems in Wisconsin. Again, the details of this specific case do not concern us. What does is that so-called Public-Private Partnerships are anathema to the free-enterprise system, and this analyst swallows them whole, without question. Let us thrust ourselves into the scenario depicted above: state-run restaurants. Now, the “libertarian” commentator urges a PPP for this industry. This means, if it means anything at all, that private enterprise combines with government in some sort of unholy alliance, and becomes a creature combining the characteristics of both. But that can only be a first approximation, since the two are necessarily incompatible. For government rests on coercion, and the market is the quintessentially voluntary institution. So, what trait must this mischievous combination of the two take on? Clearly those of the former. If an organization is in part based on coercive levies, and part on voluntary contributions, then, as a whole, it takes on that of the former. This is because if a group is coercive part of the time, then it is a coercive group.

#### Government funding crowds out the private sector

Abigail Payne, Professor of Economics at McMaster University, July 2009, “Does Government Funding Change Behavior? An Empirical Analysis of Crowd‐Out,” www.nber.org/chapters/c10574.pdf

When governments introduce programs or funding for initiatives that are partially provided by lower levels of governments or in the private or third sectors, should the government be concerned about whether its efforts are crowded out by changes in behavior by individuals and institutions participating in the pro-ision of this good or service? The bulk of the theoretical literature suggests that crowd‐out is an issue. The (historic) bulk of the empirical literature, however, has failed to find a measurable crowd‐out effect. With better data and more sophisticated empirical techniques, there is a burgeoning literature that shows that crowd‐out exists. The purpose of this paper is to examine the recent literature that studies the issue of crowd‐out across a variety of venues to under- stand better the empirical estimation issues as well as the institutional details that can lead to a better understanding of the effects of government programs on individuals and organizations.

#### Public and private action cannot be successfully combined

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 391

But more. An unholy alliance of public and private tends to obliterate the crucial line between them. As there is no more important distinction in all of political economy than that which divides coercion and non-coercion, such combinations tend to blur this crucial difference. To see such perversions advocated by a self-claimed libertarian organization is surely problematic.

### Net Benefit – Politics

#### Privatization is popular because it provides an alternative to federal spending

Lisa Schweitzer, Associate professor in the School of Policy, Planning and Development at USC, 7/13/2011, “For sale: U.S. infrastructure?”

http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/13/opinion/la-oe-schweitzer-infrastructure-20110713

The draconian spending proposal, dubbed "the Republican road to ruin" by critics, comes at a time when groups such as the American Society of Civil Engineers are saying that the U.S. needs to invest an additional $1 trillion beyond current levels over the next decade just to maintain and repair existing infrastructure. We are facing a road infrastructure crisis, and it is of our own making. The federal gas tax has been unchanged, at 18 cents, since 1993, even as vehicles have gotten more fuel efficient. Adjusted for inflation, it amounts to a measly 12 cents today. But Americans, according to surveys, don't want to raise the tax. For politicians like Mica, this opens doors to privatization projects. Last month, he introduced a bill that would put private companies in charge of Amtrak's operations in the Northeast Corridor. Taking that step, he contended, would be the fastest way to get high-speed rail up and running in the U.S. because it's clear that President Obama's federally sponsored rail plan has little support in Congress.

#### Transportation privatization is popular – Americans want to pay tolls not taxes

Chris Mitchell, Director of Communications at the Reason Foundation, 12/20/2011, “77 Percent of Americans Oppose Raising the Gas Tax, Reason-Rupe Transportation Poll Finds,” http://reason.org/news/show/reason-rupe-transportation-infrastr

A majority of Americans believe new transportation projects should be paid for with user-fees instead of tax increases, according to a new national Reason-Rupe poll of 1,200 adults on cell phones and land lines. The Reason-Rupe poll finds 77 percent of Americans oppose increasing the federal gas tax, while just 19 percent favor raising the tax, which is currently 18.4 cents a gallon. The public thinks the government wastes the gas tax money it already receives. Sixty-five percent say the government spends transportation funding ineffectively, and just 23 say the money is spent effectively. The survey shows Americans believe new roads and highways should be paid for by the people driving on them: 58 percent of Americans say new roads and highways should be funded by tolls. Twenty-eight percent say new road capacity should be paid for by tax increases.

#### Transportation privatization popular – high speed rail proves

Chris Mitchell, Director of Communications at the Reason Foundation, 12/20/2011, “77 Percent of Americans Oppose Raising the Gas Tax, Reason-Rupe Transportation Poll Finds,” http://reason.org/news/show/reason-rupe-transportation-infrastr

As the debate over high-speed rail continues in California and elsewhere, a solid majority of Americans, 55 percent, say the private sector should build high-speed train systems where it thinks riders will pay to use rail. Just 35 percent of Americans believe federal and state governments should build high-speed rail systems where they think the trains are needed.

### Solvency – Transportation Infrastructure

#### Government involvement in transportation ensures failure – privatization key to successful infrastructure development

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, “Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,”

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

From ocean voyages to flights into outer space, new ways of traveling generate excitement because they expand opportunities for travelers to visit faraway places and to reach their destinations faster. Today, Americans’ interest in new travel options has been piqued by the possibility of high-speed rail service that exceeds 300 miles an hour and by supersonic air service that does little damage to the environment. At the same time, most travelers would be ecstatic if they could drive on well-maintained roads at posted speed limits during rush hours, fly on airplanes that arrived at their destinations on time, and commute on buses and subways that provided safe, reliable, and clean service. Instead they are frustrated by a variety of problems with the nation’s transportation system and disillusioned with public officials who seem incapable of enacting policies that will improve their travel experiences. Historically, the private sector developed and operated new modes of commercial passenger and freight transportation in the United States and built transportation equipment and infrastructure. Those accomplishments were brought about by some of the nation’s greatest business leaders, who were attracted to the transportation sector. According to the Harvard Busi- ness School’s compilation of 1,000 Great American Business Leaders of the Twentieth Century, encompassing twenty-one industry classifications, 102 were leaders of transportation service companies (airlines and railways) or transportation manufacturing companies (automobiles and aerospace). Wright and Murphy (2009) compiled data indicating that by 1860 at least 7,000 private U.S. corporations had formed to operate bridges, canals, ferries, railroads, and roads. Total private capital investment in those transpor-tation facilities and services amounted to roughly $3 billion (in 1860 dollars), a significant share of the gross domestic product (GDP). Most government investment in transportation was in local bridges, roads, and, in some states, canals. Klein and Majewski (2006) report that cumulative private sector investment in turnpike construction from 1800 to 1830 in New England and Middle Atlantic states amounted to 6.2 percent of those states’ 1830 GDP. By comparison, spending between 1956 and 1995 by all levels of government to build the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways amounted to 4.3 percent of 1996 GDP. Over time, however, all levels of government became increasingly involved in regulating, and in some cases operating and owning, transportation modes and infrastructure. The trend culminated in the post–World War II period with the creation of the federal Interstate Highway System. In the late 1970s, as part of a broader movement away from government intervention in the economy, the pendulum began to swing back when Congress partially deregulated most intercity transportation services. Since then, policymakers have pursued “partnerships” with the private sector in an effort to raise funds to maintain highways and airports and to build new transportation infrastructure. In essence, the United States has been trying to find an optimal mix of public and private sector involvement in transportation since its founding. Do the current problems with the transportation system suggest that the nation should find a new stable equilibrium that will persist indefinitely? The unequivocal answer in this book is yes—namely, by designing experiments, which if successful, could take the United States back to the future by privatizing and deregulating the vast majority of the transportation system and by reducing the government’s primary role in this sector to mitigating externalities, such as emissions, and to enforcing the antitrust laws.

#### Privatization solves better and quicker

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, December 2009,

“Lessons from the U.S. Transport Deregulation Experience for Privatization,” pg. 2

Privatization would give companies that were formerly in the public sector, such as public buses, railways, airports, and highways, the freedom to set prices, raise capital, and offer service in a competitive environment. Based on the deregulation experience, privatization could generate large benefits by enabling transportation providers to develop efficient practices, to be more responsive to consumers’ preference, and to implement new technologies in a timely fashion. At the same time, privatized firms would have to overcome inefficiencies that are even greater than those that deregulated firms had to overcome because they were managed and operated by the public sector. Policymakers should be aware of this fundamental challenge and, if possible, take steps to ameliorate the difficulties that privatized firms would inevitably encounter.

### Solvency – Transportation Infrastructure

#### Privatization key to control costs and mobilize technological innovation

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, “Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,”

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

Indeed, the justification for government intervention and takeover of transportation during the past century is far from clear. One cannot make the case by simply pointing to alleged market failures, such as the existence of scale economies in transit operations, and claim that workable competition was not possible. In theory, market failures should be compared with government failures and how the consequences of each will evolve over time. Periodic financial failures by private firms are not necessarily bad if inefficient firms exit and are eventually replaced by firms that use more efficient production methods and up-to-date technologies. Public provision and regulation may cause greater social costs than are caused by private firms that are struggling financially. Moreover, such costs may be concealed from the public, the majority of whom do not realize the extent of increasing public sector inefficiencies and taxpayer subsidies. Indeed, the strongest justification for privatization may be that it can eliminate dynamic X-inefficiencies—steadily rising production costs and little innovation and technological advance.

### Solvency - Highways

#### Congestion, disrepair, and accidents all prove government mismanagement of highways – privatization solves

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 12

What reasons are there for advocating the free-market approach for the highway industry? First and foremost is the fact that the present government ownership and management has failed. The death toll, the suffocation during urban rush hours, and the poor state of repair of the highway stock are all eloquent testimony to the lack of success which has marked the reign of government control. Second, and perhaps even more important, is a reason for this state of affairs. It is by no means an accident that government operation has proven to be a debacle and that private enterprise can succeed where government has failed.

#### The free market ensures highest quality roads – government control is incompetent

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 10

It is not only that government has been staffed with incompetents. The roads authorities are staffed, sometimes, with able management. Nor can it be denied that at least some who have achieved high rank in the world of private business have been incompetent. The advantage enjoyed by the market is the automatic reward and penalty system imposed by profits and losses. When customers are pleased, they continue patronizing those merchants who have served them well. These businesses are thus allowed to earn a profit. They can prosper and expand. Entrepreneurs who fail to satisfy, on the other hand, are soon driven to bankruptcy. This is a continual process repeated day in, day out. There is always a tendency in the market for the reward of the able and the deterrence of those who are not efficient. Nothing like perfection is ever reached, but the continual grinding down of the ineffective and rewarding of the competent, brings about a level of managerial skill unmatched by any other system. Whatever may be said of the political arena, it is one which completely lacks this market process. Although there are cases where capability rises to the fore, there is no continual process which promotes this. Because this is well known, even elementary, we have entrusted the market to produce the bulk of our consumer goods and capital equipment. What is difficult to see is that this analysis applies to the provision of roads no less than to fountain pens, frisbees, or fishsticks.

#### Privatizing roads would provide better transportation infrastructure at lower costs

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. viii

Lest you think your money would be going up in exhaust fumes, remember that market firms, who must please customers to stay in business, provide everything better and less expensively than government, without that nasty moral hangover of forcing people to pay for things they may not use or want. Your gasoline price already includes forty to fifty cents per gallon in taxes for road building and maintenance. This means I’m paying twenty-five to thirty-three dollars per month for road use now. With privatization of roads, that cost would go down, probably considerably. It happens every time anything is moved from government hands into private hands.

### Solvency - Highways

#### Privatization solves highway congestion

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. ix

Anyone who wanted to build a new interstate would face the huge task of buying up land crossing perhaps hundreds of miles. Widening existing highways would be more likely. In Los Angeles and other large cities where traffic is consistently choked, road owners would have the incentive, and plenty of funds, to buy property along highways so they could widen them. Owners would also have incentives to improve interchanges, such as Spaghetti Junction in Atlanta. Roads would improve overall. (I interviewed a county road engineer years ago, and he told me they design circular entrance ramps deliberately with varying radii—experienced as odd changes in the curve, which force you to constantly readjust the steering wheel—to “keep drivers awake.” How many of us have trouble keeping focused for fifteen seconds on a curving entrance ramp?)

#### Privatization solves highway pollution

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. viii

Pollution and pollution controls on automobiles would also be handled by road privatization. If auto pollution were to grow too thick, people living near the offending roads would sue the biggest, most obvious target: the road owners. Road owners would therefore charge higher fees for cars without up-to-date inspection stickers. Auto manufacturers would build pollution- control equipment into cars, and advertise how cleanly they run. Automakers do this already, but under the gun of a government that mandates pollution levels and what kind of pollution controls manufacturers use. Without government interference, engineers would be free to compete to provide different technologies to reduce costs and improve horsepower while providing cleaner burning engines. With the inspection stickers being coded to your automobile’s age, manufacturer, and model, there might be a separate pollution rider on your monthly statement. Drivers of new Hondas might see a discount, while drivers of old belchers would pay fees that might be higher than the road tolls themselves.

#### The counterplan spills over – demonstrating free market success fuels further privatization

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. xvi

Another benefit of the present book is that it attempts to demonstrate the viability, efficaciousness, and, yes, morality, of the private enterprise system, addressing a difficult case in point. If we can establish that private property and the profit motive can function even in “hard cases” such as roads, the better we can make the overall case on behalf of free enterprise.

### Net Benefit – Accidents

#### Government mismanagement of highways causes accidents – kills 40,000 a year

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. xv

This is so far off the radar of public policy analysis and apart from the concerns of politicians, pundits, and commentators, that few people will take it seriously. Do not be one of them. Your very life may be at stake. For over 40,000 people die on the nation’s roadways every year (see appendix), and you or a loved one might one day join this horrid list. Do not be mislead by the oft made contention that the actual cause of highway fatalities is speed, drunkenness, vehicle malfunction, driver error, etc. These are only proximate causes. The ultimate cause of our dying like flies in traffic accidents is that those who own and manage these assets supposedly in the name of the public—the various roads bureaucrats—cannot manage their way out of the proverbial paper bag. It is they and they alone who are responsible for this carnage.

#### Privatization eliminates highway deaths from accidents

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 7

The same holds true with highways. It may well be that speed and alcohol are deleterious to safe driving; but it is the road manager’s task to ascertain that the proper standards are maintained with regard to these aspects of safety. If unsafe conditions prevail in a private, multi-story parking lot, or in a shopping mall, or in the aisles of a department store, the entrepreneur in question is held accountable. It is he who loses revenue unless and until the situation is cleared up. It is logically fallacious to place the blame for accidents on unsafe conditions, while ignoring the manager whose responsibility it is to ameliorate these factors. It is my contention that all that is needed to virtually eliminate highway deaths is a non-utopian change, in the sense that it could take place now, even given our present state of knowledge, if only society would change what it can control: the institutional arrangements that govern the nation’s highways.

#### Financial incentives ensure privatization solves accidents – prevents millions of deaths

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 14

As far as safety is concerned, presently there is no road manager who loses financially if the accident rate on “his” turnpike increases, or is higher than other comparable avenues of trans- portation. A civil servant draws his annual salary regardless of the accident toll piled up under his domain. But if he were a private owner of the road in question, in competition with numerous other highway companies (as well as other modes of transit such as airlines, trains, boats, etc.), completely dependent for financial sustenance on the voluntary payments of satisfied customers, then he would indeed lose out if his road compiled a poor safety record (assuming that customers desire, and are willing to pay for, safety). He would, then, have every incentive to try to reduce accidents, whether by technological innovations, better rules of the road, improved methods of selecting out drunken and other undesirable drivers, etc. If he failed, or did less well than his competition, he eventually would be removed from his position of responsibility. Just as we now expect better mouse-traps from a private enterprise system which rewards success and penalizes failure, so could we count on a private ownership setup to improve highway safety. Thus, as a partial answer to the challenge that private ownership would mean the deaths of mil- lions of people in traffic accidents, we reply, “There are, at present, millions of people who have been slaughtered on our nation’s highways; a changeover to the enterprise system would lead to a precipitous decline in the death and injury rate, due to the forces of competition.”

### Net Benefit – Accidents

#### Privatizing roads solves accidents – creates financial consequences

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. xv

This does not mean that were thoroughfares placed in private hands that the death toll would be zero. It would not. But, at least, every time the life of someone was tragically snuffed out, someone in a position to ameliorate these dangerous conditions would lose money, and this tends, wonderfully, to focus the minds of the owners. This is why we do not have similar problems with bananas, baskets, and bicycles, and the myriad of other goods and services supplied to us by a (relatively) free enterprise system.

#### Privatization solves accidents – reputational costs

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. viii

There are other benefits that would follow road privatization. The private roads that exist now have fewer accidents than public roads, probably in part because they’re better maintained: If private road builders let potholes remain, get reputations for high accident rates, or do repairs during rush hour, they have to deal with complaints and with people choosing other roads.

#### Government mismanagement is the cause of accidents

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 4

The reality, however, is that the government is responsible for such slaughter—the toll taken on our nation’s roadways. Whether at the local, state, regional, or national level, it is government that builds, runs, manages, administers, repairs, and plans for the roadway network. There is no need for the government to take over; it is already fully in charge, and with a vengeance. I believe there is a better way: the marketplace. Explaining how a free market can serve to provide road and highway service, as it has furnished us with practically every other good and service at our disposal, is the objective of this chapter.

### Accidents Impact – Hazmat

#### Large trucks transport hazardous materials – accidents can cause a Chernobyl level disaster

\*\*\*\*Michael Parrish, Staff writer for the Los Angeles Times, September 20, 1992 [LAT]

Day and night, an intricate national transportation network hauls the commonplace poisons of modern life across the countryside and through city neighborhoods. Chlorine for water treatment, ammonia for fertilizer, pesticides, industrial acids, corrosives, explosives and plain old gasoline are shipped in huge volumes -- along with dramatically expanding quantities of exotic new chemicals. Small things go wrong all the time on the trucks, trains, ships and planes that carry these hazardous goods. Valves leak. Drums break loose. Trucks jackknife. But big accidents happen too. And then the consequences can be enormous -- as in two train derailments in California last year that brought environmental devastation to the Sacramento River and massive disruption to Ventura County. Defenders say significant improvements have been made in the transport of hazardous materials over the last 10 years. But a Times computer study of nearly 68,000 hazardous-materials incidents in that period confirms what anyone knows who has been injured, evacuated or stuck on the freeway behind a tanker such as the one that exploded in flames Friday on the Hollywood Freeway -- or worse, who has lost a friend or relative to a hazardous-materials accident: While the U.S. transport system has yet to see the equal of Bhopal or Chernobyl, neither people nor the economy nor the land have been spared.

#### Hazardous materials spills cause species extinctions and ecosystem collapse

\*\*\*Lewiston Morning Tribune – 1/9/2002

Three water treatment plants resumed pumping water from the Clearwater River Tuesday, two days after a truck accident on U.S. Highway 12 dumped at least 6,000 gallons of diesel into the river. Fish and wildlife officials continued to monitor the river for signs of harm to the environment, while Nez Perce tribal officials questioned the wisdom of shipping hazardous materials along the winding river that is home to several threatened species. Officials from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Idaho District II Health Department and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency are advising citizens at Kamiah, Orofino and Riverside not to drink the water until test results verify it's free of contaminants. But some local officials say the water is safe. "We are fully confident there is no problem with the city of Orofino's water," said Mayor Joe Pippenger. "There is no smell or taste in the water that we can find." A press release issued by Pippenger and the city council said the water is safe to drink even if people smell or taste diesel. Kamiah Mayor Bob Olive also expressed confidence in his city's water. "We are filling the reservoir up and DEQ was going to do some testing on the water right away," said Olive. "We don't feel there is going to be a problem." Bottled water will be provided to those wishing to wait for test results. Hi-Noon Petroleum Co. at Missoula, the owner of the truck that caused the spill, arranged to have bottled drinking water shipped to Orofino, Riverside and Kamiah as a precaution. Olive said the water was available at city hall for anyone uncomfortable with drinking water from the tap. "Some people have an imagination and there are going to be people who smell and taste diesel in the water even if it's not there," he said. Lt. Col. Tim Marsano of the Idaho National Guard said the state DEQ, District II Health Department and the EPA can't give the all-clear until test results indicate the water is safe. "The incident command group has taken a wait-and-see outlook on the situation. We are waiting for the tests to come back from the lab before we are willing to tell people that the water is safe to drink." Marsano, who is serving at an information center in Lewiston established by several state, federal and local agencies responding to the spill, said the results should be in by noon today. As an extra precaution, absorbent barriers were placed in front of raw water intakes at all three treatment plants and at the city of Lewiston's water intake system to prevent diesel from finding its way into the water supply. Lewiston continues to have several days of water on reserve as well as the ability to access well water. The main plume of diesel was expected reach Lewiston sometime Tuesday night or early Wednesday morning. "We understand from DEQ probably our citizens will notice an odor (when the plume arrives) but our water system is safe and will continue to be safe," said Lewiston City Manager Jan B. Vasser. Officials from state, federal and tribal fish and wildlife agencies continued to monitor the river for signs of damage Tuesday while HazMat workers and private contractors to mopped up after the spill. HazMat workers and private contractors removed several hundred yards of soil from the accident site and are following the main plume as it progresses downstream. Marsano said it would probably not be possible to remove any more diesel from the water once it reaches the Snake River. "The incident command center feels its very unlikely any recoverable product will go past Lewiston," he said. Ed Schriever of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game said biologists observed a full range of fish and wildlife species along the river and none displayed behavior indicating harm from the spill. "We are continuing to monitor and will throughout the week," he said. The river is home to threatened and endangered species including fall chinook salmon, wild steelhead trout and bull trout. Bald eagles also winter along the river and osprey perch in trees along its banks. The spill happened in the middle of steelhead fishing season that runs from September through April. The Nez Perce Tribe said Tuesday it would participate as a partner in the clean-up effort and ongoing monitoring of environmental impacts. "This unfortunate incident has impacted an ecosystem that is vitally important to the Nez Perce Tribe," said Samuel N. Penney, Chairman of the tribe's Executive Committee. Penney also questioned the wisdom of transporting hazardous materials along the river. "Our ability to maintain and protect fish and wildlife species in a healthy and productive watershed ecosystem is impacted by the transportation of hazardous materials along the Clearwater River. This incident exemplifies the need to develop alternate routes for hazardous materials transportation where precious resources are concerned."

#### Species loss causes extinction

\*\*\*Paul Wapner, American University, Dept of International Politics and Foreign Policy, August, Politics and Life Sciences, 1994, p. 177

Massive extinction of species is dangerous, then, because one cannot predict which species are expendable to the system as a whole. As Philip Hoose remarks, "Plants and animals cannot tell us what they mean to each other." One can never be sure which species holds up fundamental biological relationships in the planetary ecosystem. And, because removing species is an irreversible act, it may be too late to save the system after the extinction of key plants or animals. According to the U.S. National Research Council, "The ramifications of an ecological change of this magnitude [vast extinction of species] are so far reaching that no one on earth will escape them." Trifling with the "lives" of species is like playing Russian roulette, with our collective future as the stakes.

### Accidents Impact – Economy

#### Traffic accidents cost billions in lawsuits and insurance costs

\*\*\*Jim Wilkinson, Policy Analyst, September, 1993 [Risk Management]

According to the National Safety Council, the minimum average cost of a fatal motor vehicle accident is estimated to be about $450,000. An accident involving an incapacitating injury will set a company back at least $42,400. The council also estimated that in the United States, motor vehicle accidents accounted for $24.5 billion in wage losses, $6.7 billion in medical expenses, $27.7 billion in insurance administration costs, $8.2 billion in uninsured work loss and over $29 billion in vehicle damages. Add to the dollar figures the grief, loss of self-esteem, loss of potential sales and inconvenience and one can begin to understand the immensity of this absolutely staggering problem. A large pizza company just recently agreed to a settlement of $2.8 million in a case involving a motor vehicle accident. That is just one of countless cases in which companies and/or their insurers had to pay millions for an incident involving a motor vehicle. As long as there are numbers like that, risk managers should take notice of their companies' programs for driver training and safety.

#### This is the biggest internal link to the economy

\*\*\*John W. Snow, Secretary of the Treasury, March 29, 2004 [States News Service]

We also need Congress to help us enact meaningful lawsuit abuse reform. Excessive, baseless suits are acting as a drag on your businesses and our nation's economy, and that's got to change. The threat of frivolous lawsuits is the ultimate disincentive for hiring new people, and the President has called on Congress to act. We have choices to make in this country regarding our economy. And I believe that we must choose a path that we know will lead to growth.We have to choose between higher taxes and lower taxes. We have to choose between economic isolationism or embracing the opportunity of the world's markets. And we must choose between our historic national attitude of "can do" and the attitude that personal injury lawyers have encouraged, and that is: "can sue."These are the choices that most impact business decisions and the future of our economy.

#### Traffic accidents devastate the economy

Joan B. Claybrook, President of the Public Citizen Committee on Senate Commerce, June 2, 2004 [FDCH]

I am testifying before you with shocking news that has, over time, sadly become hum-drum fact. Vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death for Americans from 4 to 34 -- killing 118 people every day of the year -- the same as a major airline flight crashing each and every day. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) estimates the direct cost in economic losses from vehicle crashes is $230 billion each year (in 2000 dollars), or $820 for every man, woman and child in the U.S.

### Solvency – Railroads

#### Privatized rail solves – international experience proves

Tad DeHaven, Budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute, June 2010, “Privatizing Amtrak,” www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/amtrak/subsidies

Let's privatize and deregulate passenger rail to see if it can compete with bus services and other modes of transportation. After all, dozens of countries around the globe have enlisted the private sector in the operation of their national rail systems in the last couple of decades. Joseph Vranich counted 55 nations that had either turned to the private sector or devolved their rail systems to their regional governments. Rail systems that utilize the private sector have generally provided better passenger service, increased ridership, and more efficient operations. There have been reform missteps, such as in Britain, but U.S. policymakers can learn from those mistakes to chart a smoother course.

#### Federal involvement ensures rail failure – privatization solves best

Tad DeHaven, Budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute, June 2010, “Privatizing Amtrak,” www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/amtrak/subsidies

The Department of Transportation's inspector general summed up Amtrak's situation: The current model for providing intercity passenger service continues to produce financial instability and poor service quality. Despite multiple efforts over the years to change Amtrak's structure and funding, we have a system that limps along, is never in a state-of-good-repair, awash in debt, and perpetually on the edge of collapse. In the end, Amtrak has been tasked to be all things to all people, but the model under which it operates leaves many unsatisfied. Amtrak's monopoly over intercity passenger rail travel leaves it with little incentive to provide high-quality and efficient service. The threat of potential budget cuts or elimination has been undermined by Washington's perpetual willingness to bail Amtrak out. At the same time, congressional micromanagement has prevented Amtrak from cutting routes and reducing other costs. Its unionized workforce reduces management's ability to run an efficient business. The solution is to end federal subsidies, privatize Amtrak, and open up the passenger rail business to new entrants. Routes like the Northeast Corridor, which has the population density to support passenger rail, could probably be run profitably by a private firm. Money-losing routes, such as numerous rural routes, would likely disappear. But far more cost-effective modes of transportation, particularly bus systems, already exist to support those areas.

#### Amtrak is an utter failure because it’s publicly owned – privatization key to innovation

Joseph Vranich, Former Executive Director of the National Association of Railroad Passengers, October 1997, “Replacing Amtrak: Replacing Amtrak: A Blueprint for Sustainable Passenger Rail Service,” pg. 1

Amtrak is a failed national experiment. By its own admission, Amtrak is headed for bankruptcy unless Washington provides another multi-billion-dollar bail-out. Another federal rescue is unjustified considering that federal and state subsidies to Amtrak since its inception in 1971 are nearing $22.5 billion, an amount out of proportion to Amtrak’s usefulness in most of the nation. The federal government does not run a national airline. It doesn’t operate a national bus company. There’s no justification for a national railroad passenger operation. America needs passenger trains in selected areas, but doesn’t need Amtrak’s antiquated route system, poor service, unreasonable operating deficits, and capital investment program with low rates of return. Amtrak’s failures result in part because it is a public monopoly—the very type of organization least able to innovate. This study reveals an Amtrak credibility crisis in the way it reports ridership figures, glosses over dwindling market share, understates subsidies, issues misleading cost-recovery claims, offers doubtful promises regarding high-speed rail, lacks proper authority for the freight business it recently launched, and misrepresents privatization as its applies to Amtrak. It’s time to liquidate Amtrak, privatize and regionalize parts of it, permit alternative operators to transform some long-distance trains into land-cruise trains, and stop service on hopeless routes.

### Solvency – Railroads

#### Successful privatization of freight railroads in the 80’s proves counterplan solvency

Tad DeHaven, Budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute, June 2010, “Privatizing Amtrak,” www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/amtrak/subsidies

The United States has its own positive experience with rail privatization—the privatization of freight railroads in the 1980s. When the Penn Central Railroad collapsed in 1970, it was the largest business failure in American history. Six other railroads soon followed. In 1973 Congress established the Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) to replace the seven private freight railroads. Conrail, which consumed $8 billion of federal subsidies, floundered until Congress finally provided regulatory relief in the early 1980s.60 Deregulation allowed Conrail to become profitable and the company was sold to private shareholders in 1987 for $1.6 billion, which at the time was the largest initial public stock offering in U.S. history.61 Over the last two decades, U.S. freight railroads—operating in a deregulated environment—have been a dramatic success. Rail's share of total U.S. freight has increased substantially. Passenger rail might also succeed if Congress ever lays aside its parochial concerns and puts America's passenger rail system back into the private sector.

#### Railroad privatization solves – buses prove

Tad DeHaven, Budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute, June 2010, “Privatizing Amtrak,” www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/amtrak/subsidies

If Amtrak is privatized, passenger rail will be in a much better position to compete with resurgent intercity bus services. The rapid growth in bus services in recent years illustrates how private markets can solve our mobility needs if left reasonably unregulated and unsubsidized. A Washington Post reporter detailed her experiences with today's low-cost intercity buses: "This new species offers curbside pickup and drop-offs, cheap fares, clean restrooms, express service, online reservations, free WiFi and loyalty programs . . . The bus fares undercut Amtrak and, depending on the number of passengers, personal vehicles."55

#### Federal railroad management is terrible – only utilization of market forces can solve

Tad DeHaven, Budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute, June 2010, “Privatizing Amtrak,” www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/amtrak/subsidies

Amtrak has been providing second-rate train service for almost four decades, while consuming almost $40 billion in federal subsidies. The system has never earned a profit and most of its routes lose money. Amtrak's on-time record is very poor, and the system as a whole only accounts for 0.1 percent of America's passenger travel. Another problem is that Amtrak's infrastructure is in bad shape. Most of the blame for Amtrak's woes should be pinned on Congress, which insists on supporting an extensive, nationwide system of passenger rail that doesn't make economic sense. The solution is to privatize and deregulate passenger rail. Varying degrees of private involvement in passenger rail have been pursued abroad, such as in Australia, Britain, Germany, Japan, and New Zealand. Privatization would allow Amtrak greater flexibility in its finances, in capital investment, and in the operation of its services—free from costly meddling by Congress.

### Solvency – High Speed Rail

#### Privatization solves high speed rails better and faster – Taiwan and South Korea prove

Tsung-Chung Kao, Professor of Civil Engineering at National Taiwan University, 9/22/2010, “Privatization Versus Public Works for High-Speed Rail Projects,” pg. 18

With its virtues of high speed, large capacity, reduced levels of energy consumption, and low levels of pollution, high-speed rail (HSR) is emerging as an attractive transportation system. Because of the large investment burden required for HSR projects and the inefficiency of government-sponsored public works projects, many countries are now turning to the alternative of privatizing their HSR projects. The present research evaluates the success of privatized versus public HSR projects by comparing the outcomes for the Taiwan high-speed rail (THSR) project and the South Korean high-speed rail (KHSR) proj-ect. Except for the project delivery method (privatized versus public works), these two projects had similar project scopes and objectives and had parallel execution times. The results of the study indicate that a privatized HSR project such as THSR has a better likelihood of achieving traditional project management success in terms of time, cost, and quality; however, a government-sponsored HSR project such as KHSR could successfully promote the national HSR industry.

#### Privatization solves high speed rail faster

Transportation Nation, 6/15/2011, “Republicans: Privatizing Amtrak Will Bring High Speed Rail to the NE Faster,” http://transportationnation.org/2011/06/15/republicans-privatizing-amtrak-will-bring-high-speed-rail-to-the-ne-faster/

Republicans said today that privatizing the Northeast Corridor would bring high-speed rail to the country faster — and more cheaply — than Amtrak can. Congressman John Mica, the chair of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, has never hidden his disdain for Amtrak — or his enthusiasm for partnering with the private sector. In a statement today, he said: “After 40 years of highly-subsidized, poorly-managed Amtrak operations, it’s time for Congress to change the direction of America’s failed high-speed and intercity passenger rail service…After spending billions of dollars, Amtrak and its snail speed, last-century level of service have reached the end of the line.” The plan, which Mica unveiled today along with Congressman Bill Shuster, is called the “Competition for Intercity Passenger Rail in America Act.” The pair introduced it in a video conference. A draft of the legislation can be found here. The goal is to separate the Northeast Corridor — Amtrak’s busiest route — from the rest of the system, transfer title from Amtrak to the US Department of Transportation, and put development of high-speed rail along the corridor out for bid. Republicans said this plan would increase ridership, lower costs, and bring fast trains to the corridor in less than ten years.

#### Privatized high speed rail shows improvement across all evaluation criteria

Tsung-Chung Kao, Professor of Civil Engineering at National Taiwan University, 9/22/2010, “Privatization Versus Public Works for High-Speed Rail Projects,” pg. 18

The privatization of the THSR project presented a unique opportunity to explore the effects of privatization on HSR projects. The study showed that privatization of the THSR project was able to curtail the external influences that might impede the implementation of a project. Moreover, a privatized HSR project has a better chance of achieving the traditional project management success according to the criteria of completion time, cost, and quality.

### Solvency – Maritime Ports

#### Port privatization solves – stimulates infrastructure development

Christopher Clott, Associate Professor of Maritime Policy and Management at CSU – Vallejo, 2009, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure,” www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf

Maritime port privatization in some circumstances can stimulate and revitalize port infrastructure development for competitive advantage. This can enable both the port operation and private investors to benefit over many years. The risk to privatization however is that public assets are undervalued, underinvested, or in some way misutilized through poorly structured contractual agreements. Short-sighted, profit motivated fiscal goals of port authorities and localities may get in the way of truly grasping how the private interests will maintain public infrastructures for the common good of the state or locality. Private investors who are far removed from the port properties they own or manage may not treat the “public trust” in the same way that port authorities answerable to voters and local or state governments are required to do. Global private equity firms must meet expectations of adequate return on investment to attract investors. Maritime ports operating in an intensely competitive environment may not be able to guarantee the steady rates on return demanded. In the end, the movement to private sector ownership of public infrastructure represents a new chapter in U.S. maritime port development. The privatization process for maritime ports is well along in other parts of the world that can provide useful models of what works and what does not. Private investment in U.S. maritime ports is truly the shape of things to come in the shipping industry. It remains to be seen what this will mean for ports in the future.

#### Privatization key to remove institutional barriers that undermine competitiveness and innovation

Christopher Clott, Associate Professor of Maritime Policy and Management at CSU – Vallejo, 2009, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure,” www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf

Privatization can provide economic benefits to the port by eliminating publicly sanctioned monopolies and removing institutional barriers that discourage innovation and isolate public port managements from the global marketplace (Sherman, 1998). A handful of ports on the East Coast will compete for mega-port status with the advent of the Panama Canal expansion and will most likely cater to a shrinking number of major carriers. Port rotations (the sequence in which ports are called) and channel depths will largely dictate which ports receive the majority of container traffic as carriers concentrate on fewer trade routes for economies of scale. The carriers in turn will demand preferential costs for using the port chosen as their major load center while attempting to monopolize the facility to ensure favorable pricing and transit times. Ports that specialize in break-bulk or specific cargoes because of their geographic location will compete fiercely to secure their niche. Private sector funding will go a long way in determining which ports make the necessary innovations to remain vital to international trade.

#### Private funding key to successful port operations

Christopher Clott, Associate Professor of Maritime Policy and Management at CSU – Vallejo, 2009, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure,” www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf

Financially strapped governments compete fiercely for private sector funding that can provide an infusion of capital to modernize and improve port operations. Ports may need to create coalitions with other ports and professionalize their governmental oversight such that they can gain consensus on the overall direction of port facility development with private sector financing. Unfortunately, this comes at a moment of great economic stress for many ports confronted with declining revenues in a depressed global economy. Long term contracts that involve decades of time require thoughtful and astute leadership that addresses the need of the city or locale where the port is located in addition to the port itself. A specialized port serving particular industries or locations precisely may pay off just as well as the large megaport in terms of return on investment. Physical constraints and the existence of long-standing port customers will also impact what private sector financing opportunities are available.

### Solvency - Airports

#### Full airport privatization key to US airline competitiveness

Robert Poole, President of the Reason Foundation, June 2000, “Another Reason for Airport Privatization,” http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/another-reason-for-airport-privatization/

In short, the answer to today’s serious limitations on new airline entry at U.S. airports is outright privatization, in which existing airport owners (cities, counties, and states) sell or long-term lease these facilities to professional airport firms. Real airline competition is being impeded by the outmoded management approach of U.S. airports. Much of the world is moving to a new paradigm—the airport as a for-profit enterprise—that is far more consistent with a dynamic, competitive airline market. It is high time the United States did likewise.

#### Airport privatization key to aviation sector – other countries prove

Evan Sparks, Asssociate editor at the American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/2008, "Should We Privatize Airports?" www.american.com/archive/2008/december-12-08/should-we-privatize-airports

Economists are once again wading into the deregulation debate, much to the chagrin of industry insiders but to the benefit of the traveling public. In Aviation Infrastructure Performance: A Study in Comparative Political Economy (Brookings Institution Press, $24.95), edited by economists Clifford Winston and Ginés de Rus, several authors explore how other countries have succeeded in enhancing their aviation infrastructure sectors through privatization. When it comes to such privatization, the United States trails far behind the rest of the world. Indeed, its first large-scale experiment with private airport ownership began just a few months ago, when, as part of a pilot program run by the FAA, Chicago’s Midway Airport was sold for $2.5 billion to a consortium including Citigroup, Vancouver International Airport, and John Hancock Life Insurance. Winston and de Rus report that in many foreign countries, “privatization has not had an adverse effect on an air transportation system’s performance.” The countries that have experimented with airline privatization include Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Canada, and China. In Australia, where airports are privately owned in order to optimize efficiency, airport operators “under pressure from regional interests” have incentives to make “excessive investments.” Early in the privatization process, price caps were set too low, causing airports to suffer excessive losses. The caps were then replaced by “monitoring,” which has allowed airport fees to rise but not above uncompetitive levels. Canada’s major airports, by contrast, are owned by nonprofit corporations designed to boost airport investment. Their investment objectives have been largely achieved, but the nonprofit model has led to higher airport fees than might otherwise prevail. China has adopted an incremental approach to privatization. Six of its largest airports have been listed publicly since the mid-1990s in order to improve airport efficiency. Although listed airports perform better than their unlisted peers, their performance has fallen short of expectations, which University of British Columbia scholars Anming Zhang and Andrew Yuen attribute to “the fact that the state (the local or national government) still maintains a controlling interest in all the listed airports. As a result of these partial privatizations, the state still has a great influence on their operation and investment decisions.” The UK’s big experiment in aviation infrastructure privatization was a failure. Privatized in 1986, BAA plc (now owned by Spanish infrastructure giant Ferrovial) owns London’s three largest airports—Heathrow, Gatwick, and Stansted—which together comprise 91 percent of passenger traffic in the southeast of England. This past August, the UK Competition Commission reported that common ownership has had profoundly anticompetitive effects, and it recommended that BAA sell two of its London airports and one of its main Scottish airports. (BAA responded by beginning the process of selling Gatwick.) The original rationale for consolidating control of British airports was that only a large entity such as BAA had the resources to fund major improvements. But the Competition Commission found that BAA was capable of handling only one major project at a time, leaving its other airports—and London travelers—to languish. The results of foreign privatization experiments affirm that competition, choice, and proper incentives are the essential components of a safe and efficient aviation infrastructure sector. U.S. policymakers and airline executives ought to pay close attention.

#### Privatized airports are more successful than public airports

Robert Poole, President of the Reason Foundation, June 2000, “Another Reason for Airport Privatization,” http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/another-reason-for-airport-privatization/

Privatized airports (and also leading “corporatized” airports such as Amsterdam and Frankfurt) are run as businesses, intended to make a profit by aggressively developing various profit centers, tailoring their services to many different groups (including airlines, originating passengers, transfer passengers, meeters and greeters, and employees). Recent research at Oxford University has shown that the management approach of privatized airports is—not surprisingly—significantly more passenger-friendly than that of traditionally managed airports.

### Solvency – Space

#### Private enterprise solves – market barriers won’t be prohibitive

Naveen Jain, chief executive officer and co-founder of Intelius, 4/20/2011, “Our Sputnik Moment: US Entrepreneurs Needed for the "Space Race”,” TFD News, http://www.tfdnews.com/news/2011/04/20/93401-naveen-jain-our-sputnik-moment-us-entrepreneurs-needed-for-space-race.htm

To re-launch our space program, we need private enterprise to step into the void. Government funding only needs to take us to the point where the technology has been developed to get us to the Moon -- and we already have that. It's a model that's been used successfully in the past: the military first developed the Internet, and private enterprise then seized on its commercial potential; the same thing occurred with GPS technology. Naturally, there are barriers to entrepreneurs leading the charge to the Moon. For one thing, ownership is always a point of discussion -- but the fact is that "everyone" and "no one" owns the Moon. Much like when mining resources from international waters (as in fishing), entrepreneurs would need to respect the rights of other business and government players. There is legal precedent for explorers finding and keeping resources that they have uncovered via private investment. There's also the question of whether we can transport resources from the Moon in a cost-effective manner. Perhaps the cost of rocket launches -- by far the greatest expense for a Moon mission -- will come down as more entrepreneurs move into this market, or new technology will make them cheaper. It's even possible to create rocket fuel from resources on the Moon, which would slash return costs and even lower launch costs from Earth. On the other hand, mining and transporting these resources back to the Earth could depress prices as supplies grow, making such ventures less appealing to entrepreneurs. As with all private market endeavors, many will want to take a wait-and-see approach to the Moon's market potential. But therein lies the opportunity for early movers who apply entrepreneurship to the opening of whole new markets, and in the case of the Moon, a whole new world.

#### Private development key to innovation and technology development

Joseph N. Pelton, Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington University, May 2010, “A new space vision for NASA—And for space entrepreneurs too?” Space Policy, p.78

XPrize Founder Peter Diamandis has noted that we don't have governments operating taxi companies, building computers, or running airlines-and this is for a very good reason. Commercial organizations are, on balance, better managed, more agile, more innovative, and more market responsive than government agencies. People as diverse as movie maker James Cameron and Peter Diamandis feel that the best way forward is to let space entrepreneurs play a greater role in space development and innovation. Cameron strongly endorsed a greater role for commercial creativity in U.S. space programs in a February 2010 Washington Post article and explained why he felt this was the best way forward in humanity's greatest adventure: “I applaud President Obama's bold decision for NASA to focus on building a space exploration program that can drive innovation and provide inspiration to the world. This is the path that can make our dreams in space a reality”

#### Private leadership boosts innovation and jobs.

Esther Dyson, chairman of EDventure Holdings and an investor in a variety of start-ups, 2/8/2010, “Prepare for Liftoff,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/08/prepare\_for\_liftoff?page=0,1

But in the long run, the new approach will create more jobs -- and more value -- because the United States will end up with both an innovative, long-term government space program and an energetic, fast-growing private-sector market that will transport people and cargo for the U.S. government, space tourists, and non-U.S. governments. Ultimately, the costs and risks of space transport will come down, flights will increase, and markets will grow. As with the Internet, we can't predict all the uses to which commercial innovation will put this infrastructure.

### Solvency – Space

#### Space tourism proves – private sector capable of pushing innovation.

Thomas Brannen, J.D. Candidate, Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law, Summer 2010, “Private Commercial Space Transportation’s Dependence on Space Tourism and NASA’s Responsibility to Both,” Journal of Air Law and Commerce, p.652

With the simplifications of regulatory requirements, the success of space prizes, and the gains in technology and innovation, space tourism is now finally building momentum. New spaceports are being built, old airports are being transitioned into spaceports, new RLVs are rapidly being developed, environmental regulations are being streamlined for simpler and quicker licensing procedures, and NASA is finally handing the reins of suborbital human transportation over to private entrepreneurs so it can focus on grander missions. Most importantly, the combination of efficiency, competition, and economies of scale has finally translated into lower prices for commercial launches, extending space access beyond merely the wealthy.

#### NASA empirically fails – budget overruns and failure to commercialize.

Edward L. Hudgins, director of The Objectivist Center and editor of the Cato Institute book, Space: The Free-Market Frontier, 1/28/2004, “Move Aside, NASA,” http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=2514

But after the triumphs of Apollo, NASA failed to make space more accessible to mankind. There were supposed to be shuttle flights every week; instead, there have been about four per year. The space station was projected to cost $8 billion, house a crew of 12 and be in orbit by the mid-1990s. Instead, its price tag will be $100 billion and it will have only a crew of three. Worse, neither the station nor the shuttle does much important science. Governments simply cannot provide commercial goods and services. Only private entrepreneurs can improve quality, bring down the prices, and make accessible to all individuals cars, airline trips, computers, the Internet, you name it. Thus, to avoid the errors of the shuttle and space station, NASA's mission must be very narrowly focused on exploring the moon and planets, and perhaps conducting some basic research, which also might serve a defense function. This will mean leaving low Earth orbit to the private sector.

#### Track record proves – NASA not able to solve

Joseph N. Pelton, Space & Advanced Communications Research Institute, George Washington University, May 2010, “A new space vision for NASA—And for space entrepreneurs too?” Space Policy, p.79

One might think that, since Muskwas seeking to develop his own launch capability, he was exaggerating; but a review of the record suggests otherwise. Today nearly 25 years after the Rogers and Paine Commission reports that followed the Challenger disaster, we find that the recommendations for NASA to develop a reliable and costeffective vehicle to replace the Shuttle is somewhere between being a disappointment and a fiasco. Billions of dollars have gone into various spaceplane and reusable launch vehicle developments by NASA over the past 20 years. Spaceplane projects have been started by NASA time and again amid great fanfare and major expectations and then a few years later either cancelled in failure or closed out with a whimper. The programs that NASA has given up on now include the Delta Clipper, the HL-20, X-33, the X-34, X-37, X-38, and X-43 after billions of US funds and billions more of private money have been sacrificed to the cause.

## States CP

### States Counterplan (1/2)

#### Text: The 50 state governors through the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws should adopt a comprehensive, uniform policy that:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

#### States solve infrastructure better than the federal government

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Oct-21-2011, “Infrastructure projects to fix the economy? Don’t bank on it,” The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/infrastructure-projects-to-fix-the-economy-dont-bank-on-it/2011/10/18/gIQAgtZi3L\_story.html.

When the federal government is paying for infrastructure, state officials and members of Congress fight for their shares of the funding, without worrying too much about efficiency, environmental issues or other longer-term factors. The solution is to move as much infrastructure funding as we can to the state, local and private levels. That would limit the misallocation of projects by Congress, while encouraging states to experiment with lower-cost solutions. It’s true that the states make infrastructure mistakes as well, as California appears to be doing by subsidizing high-speed rail. But at least state-level mistakes aren’t automatically repeated across the country. The states should be the laboratories for infrastructure. We should further encourage their experiments by bringing in private-sector financing. If we need more highway investment, we should take notes from Virginia, which raised a significant amount of private money to widen the Beltway. If we need to upgrade our air-traffic-control system, we should copy the Canadian approach and privatize it so that upgrades are paid for by fees on aviation users. If Amtrak were privatized, it would focus its investment where it is most needed — the densely populated Northeast. As for Reclamation and the Corps, many of their infrastructure projects would be better managed if they were handed over to the states. Reclamation’s massive Central Valley irrigation project, for example, should be transferred to the state of California, which is better positioned to make cost and environmental trade-offs regarding contentious state water issues. Other activities of these two agencies could be privatized, such as hydropower generation and the dredging of seaports. The recent infrastructure debate has focused on job creation, and whether projects are “shovel ready.” The more important question is who is holding the shovel. When it’s the federal government, we’ve found that it digs in the wrong places and leaves taxpayers with big holes in their pockets. So let’s give the shovels to state governments and private companies. They will create just as many jobs while providing more innovative and less costly infrastructure to the public. They’re ready.

### States Counterplan (2/2)

#### The counterplan is legitimate, real world and solves

Nim Razook, Professor of Legal Studies @ Oklahoma, 2000, Uniformity Private Laws, American Business Law Journal, pg. np

The means advanced by our polity to achieve regulatory uniformity are instructive for three reasons. First, examples of interstate cooperation via interstate compacts, agreements or uniform state laws appear to be the foil for national intervention. That states have somehow managed to overcome the collective action problems associated with efforts to cooperate and to reach some cooperative solution suggests that the costs of interstate cooperation are apparently not insurmountable obstacles. Second, efforts by the states to forge their own solutions can illuminate the underlying reasons for such cooperation in a system in which the forces of maximization discourage such efforts. This section suggests that they do so often to retain their autonomy and to avoid federal preemption. Finally, comparing the efforts of the Conference in promulgating and advocating uniform state laws with the decisions by Congress to preempt historically state-governed areas of law leads to a discussion of whether the Conference's efforts might influence Congressional preemption decisions.

### States Solve--Innovation

#### States solve infrastructure

Chris **Edwards**, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Nov-16-2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” Testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment.

The U.S. economy needs infrastructure, but state and local governments and the private sector are generally the best places to fund and manage it. The states should be the "laboratories of democracy" for infrastructure, and they should be able to innovate freely with new ways of financing and managing their roads, bridges, airports, seaports, and other facilities. It is true that — like the federal government — the states can make infrastructure mistakes. But at least state-level mistakes aren't automatically repeated across the country. If we ended federal involvement in high-speed rail, for example, California could continue to move ahead with its own system. Other states could wait and see how California's system was performing before putting their own taxpayers on the hook.

#### States solve the nation’s infrastructure challenges

Ed Rendell, NGA Chair 2008-2009 Feb-21-2009, Foreword to “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” by Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers of the National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

States have a key role to play in reinventing the policies and programs that will help address our nation’s infrastructure challenges. Indeed, states have repeatedly been at the forefront of overcoming these challenges. We must act now to build on our successes while exploring new opportunities. While the federal government must and will be an important partner, strengthening our infrastructure in a way that is both economically and environmentally sustainable calls for states to move forward on a number of fronts.

#### States solve through innovation

Trish Riggs and Tim Gallen, May-9-2012, “Infrastructure 2012 Highlights Innovative Solutions At State, Regional, Local Level; Points To Impact Of Recession On Infrastructure Funding Worldwide,” http://www.uli.org/sitecore/content/ULI2Home/News/PressReleases/Archives/2012/2012PressReleases/Infrastructure2012.aspx.

Constrained public budgets and a growing recognition at the local level of the importance of infrastructure— combined with lack of action at the federal level—are causing states, regions and cities across the U.S. to seek innovative infrastructure approaches and solutions. Local governments are utilizing a range of strategies, including ballot measures taken directly to the public, increased utilization of technology and pricing, and public-private partnerships, according to Infrastructure 2012: Spotlight on Leadership, released today by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and Ernst & Young LLP. This year’s report looks at an overall decline in infrastructure funding globally, and it focuses on funding solutions underway in the U.S. Even as efforts to increase infrastructure revenues at the federal level remain stalled, states and localities are looking at other ways of overcoming fiscal woes in an effort to move forward with projects that can lay the foundation for economic growth. State and local governments are funding critical infrastructure building or refurbishment needs with increased sales or gas taxes, bond issues, and user fees, including tolls. Public-private partnerships are a growing part of the equation.

### States Solve--Efficiency

#### State are more efficient at infrastructure building

Burt Folsom, a professor of history at Hillsdale College, Oct-24-2011, “What Did the Founders Say About Federal Money for Roads and Infrastructure?,”

http://www.burtfolsom.com/?p=1447

What were the results of Madison’s veto? First, no harm was done to the nation. The state of New York built the Erie Canal and the profits from it went to the state government. Perhaps, New Yorkers built that canal more carefully because they knew they were accountable if the canal lost money. Second, Madison’s concern with balancing the federal budget and avoiding unconstitutional spending paid off less than twenty years later when the U.S. retired its national debt completely and began to run surpluses. Sticking to the Constitution led to stronger national finances. If states today (or maybe even private companies) built the highways, the politicians would have strong incentives to build carefully and cheaply. And the states, instead of looking to Washington, could work together to build interstate highways and major bridges. Finally, with less power in Washington we would have a smaller Department of Transportation in Washington, and less federal debt to lay on our children and grandchildren. Almost 200 years ago, James Madison showed us the way.

#### Federal infrastructure mistakes are magnified and replicated nation wide

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Nov-16-2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” Testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment.

Perhaps the biggest problem with federal involvement in infrastructure is that when Washington makes mistakes it replicates those mistakes across the nation. Federal efforts to build massive public housing projects in dozens of cities during the 20th century had very negative economic and social effects. Or consider the distortions caused by current federal subsidies for urban light-rail systems. These subsidies bias cities across the country to opt for light rail, yet rail systems are generally less efficient and flexible than bus systems, and they saddle cities with higher operating and maintenance costs down the road.10

#### Federal infrastructure is expensive and wasteful

Hadley Heath, Sep-2-2011, “Why Federal Infrastructure Projects Are a Bad Idea,” Independent Women’s Forum, <http://www.iwf.org/blog/2432132/Why-Federal-Infrastructure-Projects-Are-a-Bad-Idea>.

NOW is right to acknowledge that government intervention in the market usually favors some groups and disadvantages others. But there's an even more important reason we should forget about federal infrastructure projects: They are rarely economically efficient. Government-run projects are notoriously wasteful and typically come in way over-budget. Money meant to employ new workers is channeled through agencies in Washington, D.C., which take their cut, and then it trickles through state and local governments, before reaching workers on the ground. And since government overseers lack the same bottom-line pressure of private sector bosses, workers don't face the same level of accountability for their work. And that's just the inefficiency that starts once the projects are picked. Needless to say, one can hardly expect politicians to prioritize projects on purely objective measures, which is why taxpayers end up funding reconstruction projects at airports with no passengers and of course bridges to nowhere.

### States Solve--Flexibility

#### States solve infrastructure in a multitude of ways

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

As the nation works to strengthen its infrastructure, states have a key role to play in reinventing a wide range of policies and programs. Some states are expanding infrastructure revenue sources by engaging in public-private partnerships, implementing new user fees, and increasing existing funding streams. States are forming new subcabinets to focus on growth and development and to coordinate policy and planning. States are reducing demand for infrastructure during peak travel periods through congestion pricing systems. They also are investing in environmentally sustainable alternatives to conventional infrastructure, such as renewable energy and transit. States are continuing to hold departments of transportation accountable for spending decisions. They are incorporating new technologies, such as smart meters, to provide consumers with real-time information on their personal energy use to encourage conservation.

#### States solve better because they’re flexible

Russell Nichols and Ryan Holeywell, Governing Staffwriters, Jun-2011, “Six Ideas for Fixing the Nation's Infrastructure Problems,” Governing, http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/six-ideas-for-fixing-the-nations-infrastructure-problems.html.

One idea that has received bipartisan support is a plan known as America Fast Forward. It’s a proposal to expand a federal program of the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) that provides low-interest loans for transportation projects. The proposal’s biggest cheerleader is Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa. In 2008, Angelinos approved a sales-tax hike for a set of highway and transit projects; but rather than funneling that revenue into new projects outright, Villaraigosa’s goal is to use the money to pay debt on a federal transportation loan. An upfront loan would allow the city to complete its projects rapidly while using the proceeds of its 30-year sales-tax hike to pay it back over time. Currently TIFIA isn’t big enough to accommodate such large-scale plans, which is why Los Angeles has backed a national push to expand the program from $122 million annually to $375 million, and to raise its cap from 33 percent of project costs to 49 percent. “It’s an idea that’s different from a grant program,” says L.A. Deputy Mayor for Transportation Jaime de la Vega. “We’re coming to the table with money and saying we need a partnership. It’s not a handout. State leaders are also backing a plan to reduce the number of federal highway programs from 55 to five, in an effort to gain greater flexibility in how the dollars are spent. That would help clear up what some people see as troublesome inconsistencies in how funds are meted out. For example, federal aid can be used for preventive maintenance of highways, but routine maintenance is considered a state responsibility. Rhode Island Transportation Director Michael Lewis recently testified before Congress that his state has to take on debt just to get the required match to receive transportation funds, when that money could have been used to perform maintenance. “Now is not the time to tie our hands and limit the use of transportation dollars and assets,” Lewis told Congress.

### States Solve Transportation Infrastructure

#### States better than federal government for highways

Wall Street Journal, Apr-15-2012, “Why Your Highway Has Potholes,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303815404577333631864470566.html?mod=WSJ\_Opinion\_LEADTop.

The best solution would be to return all the gas tax money to the states, roughly in proportion to the money each pays in. This would allow states and localities to determine which roads and transit projects they really need—and are willing to pay for. California could decide for itself if it wants more roads, whether it can afford high-speed rail, and whether it wants to use congestion-pricing on crowded roads. The House Transportation Committee has found that getting a permit for a new road costs twice as much, and takes three times as long, when federal money is included than when financed with private or local dollars. Less federal control would also allow states to lure billions of dollars of private financing for new roads, which experts like Mr. Winston believe is the next big thing in transportation financing but is now generally prohibited. One of the worst features of Ms. Boxer's Senate bill is that she would exacerbate the funding shortage by adding new penalties if states leverage private dollars to build new toll roads and bridges.

#### States solve highways

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

Surface transportation assets in the United States have been largely funded and managed by the public sector. Responsibilities for financing, building, operating, and maintaining transportation assets have been shared among states, local governments, and the federal government, although the private sector has increasingly played a role in all of these aspects (in addition to the traditional private sector role in project design and construction). States play a large role in funding and operating surface transportation assets. States raise approximately 46 percent of all revenues to fund highways and transit, with the federal government contributing approximately 22 percent and local governments contributing 32 percent. 7 In terms of responsibility for operating the system and delivering transportation services for highway and transit users, states account for 47 percent of service delivery, with local governments providing 51 percent and the federal government providing 2 percent. 8 The vast majority of roads, bridges, and highways are state or locally owned. 9 State and local governments also own significant transit and intermodal freight assets; although, independent public entities own the largest share of transit facilities. 10

#### States solve high speed rail—several states prove

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

However, high speed rail in the United States is receiving a second look by many states and regions, in light of higher fuel prices, road and airport congestion, and security concerns. In the Northeast, Amtrak ridership of the new Acela Express was 3.1 million in FY 2007, while ridership in the Northeast Corridor as a whole, including Acela Express, Regional, and Keystone ridership was approximately 12 million. 132 States from Maine to Florida are seeking to expand Amtrak’s service even further. While the Acela operates at higher speeds of up to 150 mph, Amtrak trains in the rest of the United States are slower and often run on tracks owned and operated by freight railroads. In North Carolina and Virginia, for example, state officials are seeking to address these infrastructure needs by adding double-track trains to the corridor that would allow for more frequent and faster train service between Washington, D.C.; Richmond, Virginia; and Charlotte, North Carolina. In addition, such investments would benefit regional freight rail services in the northeastern United States and possibly provide relief to the region’s congested airspace. 133

### Federal Government Doesn’t Solve Infrastructure

#### Federal government historically worse at infrastructure

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Oct-21-2011, “Infrastructure projects to fix the economy? Don’t bank on it,” The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/infrastructure-projects-to-fix-the-economy-dont-bank-on-it/2011/10/18/gIQAgtZi3L\_story.html.

For plenty of examples of the downside of federal infrastructure, look at the two oldest infrastructure agencies — the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Their histories show that the federal government shouldn’t be in the infrastructure business. Rather, state governments and the private sector are best equipped to provide it.

#### Federal policies ignore state-specific needs

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Nov-16-2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” Testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment.

Another problem is that federal infrastructure spending comes with piles of regulations. Davis-Bacon rules and other federal regulations raise the cost of building infrastructure. Regulations also impose one-size-fits-all solutions on the states, even though the states have diverse needs. The former 55-mph speed limit, which used to be tied to federal highway funds, is a good example. Today, federal highway funds come with requirements for the states to spend money on activities such as bicycle paths, which state policymakers may think are extraneous.14

#### Federal funding doesn’t solve

James B. Reed directs the Transportation program at NCSL and Jaime Rall tracks a range of transportation issues for NCSL, Mar-2011, “Dropping revenue from the fuel tax poses a dilemma for how to pay for maintaining and improving roads and bridges,” National Conference of State Legislatures,” http://www.ncsl.org/issues-research/transport/running-out-of-gas.aspx.

Recession-driven declines in overall driving coupled with larger numbers of fuel-efficient vehicles have resulted in lower gas tax revenues. At the same time, the cost of building and repairing roads continues a steady climb. The nation faces a shortfall of $58 billion a year just to maintain highways and transit systems, and $119 billion a year to improve them, according to the National Cooperative Highway Research Program. The unprecedented investment of the federal recovery act failed to fill even a single year’s gap. Even with the stimulus funds, 21 states cut transportation programs in FY 2010 and at least 11 plan to do so in FY 2011, including nine that did in 2010. “The systemic failure of current financing has made clear,” stated a blue ribbon study in Arkansas, “that the traditional approach to highway, road, street and bridge maintenance and construction is, in its present form, no longer sustainable when measured against a changing economic and technological environment, erosion of purchasing power and continuing escalation of costs.” Current revenues simply fail to meet current needs. At least a dozen other recent state studies on transportation essentials and revenue options come to the same conclusion. “The ARRA funding certainly was a help,” says Oklahoma Senator Gary Stanislawski. “But a one-time infusion of resources did not help solve the transportation infrastructure problem that the states—and our nation—are facing. No state possesses the resources to keep pace with the structural funding gap.”

### States Solve Infrastructure Comparatively Better

#### States better than the federal government

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Nov-16-2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” Testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment.

In its report on the state of U.S. infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers gives America a grade of "D."37 However, the ASCE report mainly focuses on infrastructure provided by governments, so if you believe that this low grade is correct, then it is mainly due to government failures. The ASCE lobbies for more federal spending, but OECD data shows that public-sector spending on infrastructure is about the same in this country as in other high-income nations. Some of the infrastructure shortcomings in the United States stem from mismanagement and misallocation by the federal government, rather than a lack of taxpayer support. So part of the solution is to decentralize infrastructure financing, management, and ownership as much as possible. State and local governments and the private sector are more likely to make sound investment decisions without the federal subsidies and regulations that distort their decisionmaking.

#### State would solve infrastructure more efficiently

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Nov-16-2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” Testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment.

Despite its smaller magnitude, public-sector infrastructure spending is also very important to the U.S. economy. But the usual recommendation to simply spend more federal taxpayer money on infrastructure is misguided. For one thing, the government simply can't afford more spending given its massive ongoing deficits. More importantly, much of the infrastructure spending carried out by Washington would be more efficiently handled by devolving it to state and local governments and the private sector.

#### Revenue sharing means states solve better locally

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

The average state enables and oversees more than 30 different state and local economic development programs. 122 One increasingly popular economic development program is revenue sharing. These are increasingly being deployed by localities, often to aid revitalization efforts for older neighborhoods and business districts that are often already wellserved by public transportation. The revenue sharing technique involves each community designating some part of its assessed value base, or of a stream of tax revenues, for inclusion in a regional pool of assessed values or tax revenues that is then divided among all localities in the pool by some formula, usually involving population size and other variables. In theory, these strategies reduce competition among localities for non-residential properties, provide fairer sharing of taxable assessed value, create greater equality among per-capita assessed value bases across the entire region, and can make possible land-use planning that encompasses the entire region encompassed. In addition to fostering economic development/jobs, these programs may help simultaneously support sustainable infrastructure by boosting the real estate value in these communities.

### States Race to the Top

#### States race to the top

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Oct-24-2011, “The Downside of Federal Infrastructure Spending,” Cato Institute, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/the-downside-of-federal-infrastructure-spending/.

Critique: Maybe the federal government screws up, but so do state governments and private companies.

Response: Of course. But as the op-ed noted, when the Feds screw-up they botch it for the entire country, often for many decades. The federal government is a monopoly, and monopolies breed inefficiency. By contrast, the states compete with each other and learn from each other to an extent. And when private companies screw up repeatedly, they go belly up.

#### Competition means states will race-to-the-top

Henry N. Butler and Jonathan R. Macey, Distinguished Teaching Professor of Law and Economics at University of Kansas Law and Business, J. DuPratt White Professor of Law, Cornell University School of Law, 1996, CONSTRUCTING A NEW FEDERALISM: JURISDICTIONAL COMPETENCE AND COMPETITION: ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION: Externalities and the Matching Principle: The Case for Reallocating Environmental Regulatory Authority, pg. np

Finally, the race-to-the-bottom rationale for federal government domination of environmental regulation is based on the assumption that the federal government in practice can do a better job at regulating than the state governments. There are strong reasons to believe that this assumption is wrong. The race-to-the-bottom justification for federal intervention, while critical of state political processes, ignores the problem of interest group domination of the legislative process in Washington. The interest group problem is more acute at the federal level than at the state level due to the lack of competition among regulators at the national level. On the other hand, there are numerous reasons to believe that the Washington political market reflects its own regulatory common pool problem, with logrolling for environmental votes with votes on totally unrelated issues.

#### The states alone create better solutions to any problem

Larry E. Ribstein and Bruce H. Kobayashi, Foundation Professor and Associate Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law, 1996, An Economic Analysis of Uniform State Laws, 25 J. Legal Stud. 131, pg. np

A decentralized decision-making process normally can produce more possible solutions to a problem than could a single rulemaker. As a result, innovation and experimentation through a decentralized lawmaking process may produce at least some laws that are better than what a single uniform lawmaker could write. This argument for nonuniformity may apply even if the benefits of uniformity appear to outweigh the costs in a particular context. Without advance knowledge of the discoveries this process would produce, it is impossible to determine ex ante whether competition among unknown alternatives will produce more efficient results than the centralized rule. One might discount this argument for uniformity on the ground that state legislators may lack incentives to innovate. However, even if this is true, uniform laws do not necessarily solve this problem because they are designed to appeal to the least innovative legislatures --precisely the ones that would most rely on outside drafters. Moreover, the difficulty of changing uniform laws, and states' reluctance to make their currently uniform laws nonuniform, may further slow the pace of statutory innovation.

### AT: Crosses State Lines

#### Federal government not needed, even if it crosses state lines—private companies prove

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Oct-24-2011, “The Downside of Federal Infrastructure Spending,” Cato Institute, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/the-downside-of-federal-infrastructure-spending/.

Critique: We need the federal government for things like the Interstate Highway System because infrastructure crosses state lines.

Response: Numerous people made this point regarding my op-ed, but I’m afraid they didn’t put their thinking caps on. Private energy pipelines cross state and international borders, and so do the huge systems of the private freight railroads, such as Union Pacific.

#### States coordinate on infrastructure projects

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

Coordinate infrastructure decisions across government agencies and levels of government as well as between states and regions and ensure that energy and environmental costs and concerns are considered. New efforts are needed to enhance planning and coordination across levels of government. States are pursuing new governance models that seek to break down silos and ensure that state infrastructure investments are coordinated across agencies to leverage maximum benefits. In addition, states are incorporating energy and environmental considerations into state planning efforts and improving coordination with neighboring states in situations where regional infrastructure is involved.

#### States work together on infrastructure

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

While there has been discussion of coordinating and combining funding sources for infrastructure and requiring competition for projects, such as through the proposed federal infrastructure bank, it is not likely that the majority of the nation’s infrastructure dollars will be spent this way in the near future (for more on this, see Chapter 3, Section A). Instead there will likely remain dedicated funding streams for specific categories of infrastructure. However, states can act to ensure that agencies coordinate through the planning process so that state dollars are not spent at cross-purposes. For example, states can work to coordinate expenditures on transportation and housing in an attempt to link communities with transit.

### AT: States Have No Money

#### States have multiple revenue streams for infrastructure

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

As noted in previous sections, states face serious revenue challenges to fund necessary infrastructure repairs and improvements. Thus, states are pursuing or considering a variety of new revenue strategies to augment existing sources including: new twists on government funding, private sector funding and financing, and taxes and user fees. While states have long relied on traditional versions of these measures to pay for most categories of infrastructure, new actions to refine or rethink the use of these tools are being employed including inflation-indexing of current fuel taxes, creative use of sales taxes and tax credits, establishing PPPs to leverage private capital, and creating new carbon-based taxes and using proceeds from the auction of emissions credits under GHG cap and trade programs. These funding mechanisms, in addition to serving as a source of new revenue can also help manage demand. These related benefits from such revenue sources mentioned are noted in the following sections.

#### Federal government is an irresponsible spender

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Oct-24-2011, “The Downside of Federal Infrastructure Spending,” Cato Institute, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/the-downside-of-federal-infrastructure-spending/.

Critique: My view of devolving infrastructure funding to the states is unrealistic because only the federal government has enough “resources” to do big projects.

Response: The federal government has no magical source of money. All “federal dollars” ultimately come from taxpayers who live in the 50 states. It is true that the federal government can run larger deficits that state governments, but that’s a reason not to give the Feds responsibility for spending activities because they tend to go hog wild.

### AT: States Spending DA

#### Federal infrastructure spending worsens state budget shortfalls

David Y. Denholm is president of the Public Service Research Foundation, Mar-1-2009, “Federal Infrastructure Push May Worsen State, Local Budget Problems,” The Heartland Institute, http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2009/03/01/federal-infrastructure-push-may-worsen-state-local-budget-problems.

Some States Hit Harder The problem for states is that federal infrastructure spending rarely covers 100 percent of construction costs, instead commonly providing a rather small percent of the total project cost. In states without prevailing wage laws, increased federal participation in infrastructure spending decisions, plus Davis-Bacon, could increase the cost of projects more than the value of the federal contribution.

#### Federal infrastructure spending hurts state budgets

Peter Swanson is a Hatton W. Sumners Scholar at the National Center for Policy Analysis, Dec-1-2011, “Infrastructure Funding: Taking the Wrong Path,” http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba760.

Some states saw the additional federal funding as an opportunity to begin new major transportation projects. For example, California received funds for its high-speed rail project linking Southern California and Northern California. However, California is financially overextended and it is unclear how the state will be able to fund the project. Consider: The rail line was initially expected to cost $43 billion, including $17 billion to $19 billion in federal funding.

Total costs are now expected to range from $65 billion to $81 billion.

To date, however, the state has only received $3.6 billion in federal funds.

Federal policy also clashed with state interest in the case of Wisconsin. Wisconsin won $810 million in funds for a new rail line between Milwaukee and Madison as part of the stimulus. The seed grant was initially accepted by then-Governor Jim Doyle (D). Current Governor Scott Walker (R) opposed the project and the Obama administration has since taken the money and redistributed it to other states. Walker opposed the project because the majority of the cost would have to be absorbed in the already strained state budget.

#### States already spend the most on infrastructure

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

States and localities in the United States have provided approximately 75 percent of total transportation and water spending. As noted earlier, federal spending on highways has accounted for less of the overall share of spending than states and localities and CBO notes that since the 1970s when the federal share of infrastructure spending peaked, states and localities spending has increased relative to federal spending (see Figure 2).

### AT: Permutation

#### Fed involvement will tank the project

Scott Thomasson is president of NewBuild Strategies LLC, an energy and infrastructure consulting firm in Washington, DC, April-2012, “Encouraging U.S. Infrastructure Investment,” Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/infrastructure/encouraging-us-infrastructure-investment/p27771.

States are already looking at new ways to finance infrastructure as federal funding becomes uncertain and their own budgets are strained. More states rely on PPPs to share the costs and risks of new projects, and they are finding new sources of nontax revenues to fund investments, like tolling and higher utility rates. But at the same time, federal regulations and tax laws often prevent states from taking advantage of creative methods to finance projects. Federal programs designed to facilitate innovative state financing are underfunded, backlogged, or saddled with dysfunctional application processes. Many of these obstacles can be removed by adjusting regulations and tax rules to empower states to use the tools already available to them, and by better managing federal credit programs that have become so popular with states and private investors.

#### Federal government involvement means funding gets wasted on unnecessary projects

Peter Swanson is a Hatton W. Sumners Scholar at the National Center for Policy Analysis, Dec-1-2011, “Infrastructure Funding: Taking the Wrong Path,” http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba760.

The United States has the capability to address the country’s infrastructure issues, but there is only a loose connection between federal spending and improvements in public infrastructure because of misguided federal policies. Typically, the federal government offers seed funding to states to initiate capital spending projects, but leaves the states to complete and maintain them. As a result, state and local governments are encouraged to spend money on projects that may be a lower priority than projects initiated and funded locally.

#### Federal-state cooperation causes cost overruns

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Nov-16-2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” Testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment.

Federal infrastructure projects have often suffered from large cost overruns.8 Highway projects, energy projects, airport projects, and air traffic control projects have ended up costing far more than originally promised. Cost overruns can happen on both public and private infrastructure projects, but the problem is exacerbated when multiple levels of government are involved in a project because there is less accountability. Boston's Big Dig — which exploded in cost to five times the original estimate — is a classic example of mismanagement in a federal-state project.9

### AT: States CP Bad Theory

#### 1. The counterplan is predictable. The 1nc Gilman evidence is indicative of a comparative literature base surrounding social services. The key question is where we should devote attention: the federal government or the states.

#### 2. The counterplan is reciprocal. The affirmative fiats hundreds of politicians to vote for the plan, for the plan to be upheld by the Supreme Court, and to be enforced by the executive. The negative should be allowed to fiat domestic governmental actors.

#### 3. The counterplan is not multi-actor fiat. The counterplan fiats 50 governors act in unison through the NCCUSL. The 1nc Razook evidence describes this process as common, enforceable, and predictable.

#### 4. The counterplan tests the federal key warrant. The affirmative can read any advantage based off of federal action, and that is offense against the counterplan. If the negative cannot test the federal warrant, there will be a topic explosion because any harms area can then be an affirmative

#### 5. The counterplan increases affirmative ground. They can read disadvantages to any state acting, or to the NCCUSL acting as a whole.

#### 6. The counterplan increases education. The counterplan increases education about non-federal agencies and politics. Since the affirmative does not use the states, only the negative provides this education.

#### 7. Best policy option justifies negative actor testing. Since the judge is simply an individual in a room seeking solutions to problems, there is no reason his or her ballot should be limited to the federal government.

#### 8. Err negative on theory. The affirmative speaks first and last, chooses the topic, and has nearly infinite prep time to delegate towards defending their plan.

#### 9. Reject the argument not the team – If the affirmative wins that the counterplan is illegitimate, that is a reason that the counterplan should not be considered in the judge’s decision. Voting affirmative on theory is a non-starter because it does not affirm the resolution.

### Federalism Links

#### Infrastructure is a state issue

Burt Folsom, a professor of history at Hillsdale College, Oct-24-2011, “What Did the Founders Say About Federal Money for Roads and Infrastructure?,”

http://www.burtfolsom.com/?p=1447

The Constitution does not grant Congress the right to appropriate funds for infrastructure. Therefore, the Founders usually argued that states or private companies should do the work; neither good government nor just results occurred when the people in Georgia could be taxed to pave a road or build a canal in New York. The problem was, of course, that some congressmen, then as now, wanted to bring federal funds to their state. The congressmen from New York, for example, had incentives in 1817 to attract federal dollars to their state to build the ambitious Erie Canal—the longest proposed canal in the world. That canal would indeed prove to be a success and a money-maker, but President James Madison vetoed the 1817 bill to spend federal money to build the Erie Canal, and other improvements. He knew the roads were needed, but he wanted New York to build its own canal, and Georgia to pave its own roads. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution did not make road building a federal function, and Madison wanted to go with the Constitution. “I am constrained,” Madison said, “by the insuperable difficulty I feel in reconciling the bill with the Constitution.” Hence the veto.

#### Infrastructure has devolved to the states

Darren Springer and Greg Dierkers , Feb-21-2009, “An Infrastructure Vision for the 21st Century,” National Governor’s Association, http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902INFRASTRUCTUREVISION.PDF.

The state-federal partnership helped to build the Interstate Highway System. More recently, the roles of governments have been changing. In 1970, federal funding represented 28 percent of all funding (capital and operating) for highways, with states and localities providing 72 percent of highway funding. 21 In 2006, the federal contribution had fallen to only 20 percent of all highway funding, with states and localities providing 80 percent. 22 In addition to a gradual but definite trend towards the devolution of funding responsibility from the federal government to state and local governments, there have been other changes as well.

#### Federal government is a small player

Gail D. Fosler is president, The GailFosler Group LLC, a strategic advisory service for global business leaders and public policymakers, Oct-13-2010, “What the Infrastructure Debate Tells Us About America,” GailFosler Group, http://www.gailfosler.com/commentary/what-the-infrastructure-debate-tells-us-about-america.

The federal government is a relatively small player in funding national infrastructure. Of the total spending for all categories in 2004, federal government funds about $60 billion (about 15 percent of the total). (Chart 2) Half of all federal spending is allocated to highways, largely through the Highway Trust Fund; the remaining amounts are scattered among mass transit, aviation, water and waste water, and telecommunications. State and local governments account for $170 billion in infrastructure spending, while private sources account for about the same amount—mostly energy and telecommunications. Thus, the infrastructure debate is not a federal government debate; it is a national debate where state and local government and private funding outweighs the federal government by a ratio of close to 3:1.

### Politics Links

Federal infrastructure spending is unpopular

AECOM Technology Corporation, Mar-30-2011, “U.S. Infrastructure: Ignore the Need or Retake the Lead?” http://www.aecom.com/deployedfiles/Internet/Brochures/ AECOM\_ACEC%20white%20paper\_v3.pdf.

The controversy surrounding the stimulus bill combined with other legislative initiatives, including the health care reform bill, led to an electoral revolt that swept in a new wave of legislators who arrived in statehouses and Washington, D.C., with a fiscally conservative public mandate. The shifting political tide has effectively thwarted forward-thinking projects that would begin building the next generation of the nation’s infrastructure. Most notably, ambitious plans for a national network of high-speed intercity passenger rail have been tempered as newly elected governors in key states have rejected federal seed money and opponents of deficit spending continue to voice strident criticism. In this highly charged political environment, any proposed major expenditure of the taxpayers’ money will be subject to intense scrutiny against the backdrop of a fragile economic recovery, the rapidly increasing federal deficit and the ongoing burden of foreign debt obligations. As a firm that must manage within its means, AECOM understands the concerns many taxpayers express regarding deficit spending and other financial challenges facing the nation; however, infrastructure spending provides taxpayers substantial return on their investment over the long term in the form of jobs, economic growth, improved productivity, enhanced mobility, a better environment, and the safe and ample supply of public services.

#### Infrastructure spending unpopular with the public

Policy Today, Jun-2012, “AMERICA'S CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE,” http://www.policytoday.com/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=274&Itemid=149.

Projects like the interstate highway system helped make the United States a global power, allowing freight and people to move about the country. American commerce relies on roads, says someone who should know - Norman Mineta, former secretary of the commerce and transportation departments. So why he is worried? Says Mineta, transportation is a policy issue that citizens take for granted until it’s denied to them. “Everything you need – what you eat, what you wear – got there through some form of transportation, but few people care unless they’re affected by it.” However, even when they are affected by it – by broken levees in New Orleans or exploding steam pipes in New York – Mineta says most Americans would rather avoid the issue. Referring to a poll about Americans’ opinions of an increase in the gasoline tax, taken in the wake of Minnesota’s Interstate 35 bridge collapse, Mineta says he was startled to learn that a majority of Americans opposed a five-cent increase in the federal tax that help fund road projects. “You would think that the tragedy would jar people into a realization that we need to be doing something about it, but it’s one of those issues that you need a constant beating of the drum,” he says.

#### Infrastructure investment politically unpopular

Policy Today, Jun-2012, “AMERICA'S CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE,” http://www.policytoday.com/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=274&Itemid=149.

“A lot of people are throwing their hats in the ring running for president and no one is addressing infrastructure issues,” Marcuson says. “In the last couple of years, we’ve had a ceiling failure in one of the tunnels in the Big Dig and we had a catastrophic failure with the I-35 bridge in Minnesota. All of these things have a pretty short window and the country has to take advantage of that window. We have to get the politicians’ attention.” That might be difficult, says C. William Ibbs of the University of California at Berkeley, where he teaches engineering and planning. “Politicians want things that will bring them instant votes than things that take them 12 years to build. It’s a disconnect between the attention span of the politicians and the required time to build major projects,” Ibbs says.

### Spending Links

#### Federal infrastructure spending breaks the bank

Peter Flaherty, Sept-7-2011, “Infrastructure Spending Promotes Inefficiency, Corruption,” National Legal and Policy Center, http://nlpc.org/stories/2011/09/07/obamas-infrastructure-spending-promotes-inefficiency-corruption.

Infrastructure spending by the federal government promotes corruption because the work goes to the most politically well-connected contractors. At the state level where the money is spent, it is often "pay to play." Since decisions about infrastructure spending often result from a brokered process (witness Congressional earmarks), there is often a disconnect between the spending and where it is needed most. Politicians collude with unions to increase the costs of construction through what are called Project Labor Agreements. These pacts are supposed to guarantee labor peace, but what they actually do is pad the costs of labor to the benefit of politically well-connected unions. Federal "prevailing wage" requirements (Davis Bacon) ensure that infrastructure spending costs more than the market would dictate. The result is inefficiencies in spending and the creation of fewer jobs. We suffer from an overhang of debt. Adding to the burden by spending billions more on public works projects does not solve the problem. It makes it worse. "Stimulus" spending, or whatever you want to call it, is modern-day alchemy.

#### Federal projects are more expensive because of wage laws

Stephen Bronars, Feb-21-2012, “Infrastructure Spending and the Davis-Bacon Act,” Bronars Economics, http://sbronars.wordpress.com/2012/02/21/infrastructure-spending-and-the-davis-bacon-act/.

Government infrastructure spending makes sense because borrowing costs are low; the 10 year Treasury bond rate is about 2%. This argument would be bolstered if labor costs were also relatively low. The Davis-Bacon Act, however, forces government contractors to pay artificially high wages and benefits. This means that fewer projects will be completed for each billion dollars budgeted for infrastructure. If the wages paid on government construction projects could freely adjust to market conditions, labor costs would be much lower in many parts of the U.S. The following figure shows construction employment in three states particularly hard hit by the 2008 recession: Florida, Michigan, and Nevada. Construction employment is down 40% to 62% from its pre-recession peak in these states. The large demand reductions in the Florida, Michigan and Nevada construction industries put downward pressure on construction wages. Davis-Bacon prevents this from lowering labor costs for Federal projects. The U.S. Department of Labor sets the prevailing wage in each area based on surveys of unions and employers that are administered by its Wage and Hours Division (not the Bureau of Labor Statistics).

## State Development K

### 1NC State Development Kritik

#### Locating their affirmative in traditional political engagement with the state undermines revolutionary potential

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-25-2011, “Slavoj Žižek speaks at Occupy Wall Street: Transcript,” http://www.imposemagazine.com/bytes/slavoj-zizek-at-occupy-wall-street-transcript

Remember. The problem is not corruption or greed. The problem is the system. It forces you to be corrupt. Beware not only of the enemies, but also of false friends who are already working to dilute this process. In the same way you get coffee without caffeine, beer without alcohol, ice cream without fat, they will try to make this into a harmless, moral protest. A decaffienated protest. But the reason we are here is that we have had enough of a world where, to recycle Coke cans, to give a couple of dollars for charity, or to buy a Starbucks cappuccino where 1% goes to third world starving children is enough to make us feel good. After outsourcing work and torture, after marriage agencies are now outsourcing our love life, we can see that for a long time, we allow our political engagement also to be outsourced. We want it back. We are not Communists if Communism means a system which collapsed in 1990. Remember that today those Communists are the most efficient, ruthless Capitalists. In China today, we have Capitalism which is even more dynamic than your American Capitalism, but doesn’t need democracy. Which means when you criticize Capitalism, don’t allow yourself to be blackmailed that you are against democracy. The marriage between democracy and Capitalism is over. The change is possible.

#### This ideology of state politics generates infinite wars and kills all value

Lila Rajiva, Masters in Economics, Doctoral work in international relations and political philosophy, 2006, The New Centennial Review 6.1 (2006) 133-169, “Prometheus The Emergence of the Police State in America

Indeed, to act with impunity, the state prefers a control that leaves no marks, that operates through fear, that appears to its citizens as invisible satellite eyes in outer space, as robot sensors, as scanners that probe mechanically, as spy software that reads keystroke to keystroke the random fluctuations of inner space. Through fear, control remains anonymous and invisible. Invisible, it becomes inevitable, virtuous, and complete. In this fascination with collapsing the boundaries of spirit and body, with dynamism and flux, with probing the outermost and the innermost, the Promethean betrays itself as romantic in its aesthetic, despite its rhetoric of reason and law. Entrepreneurship presents itself less as a necessity of capitalism than as a spiritual ideal of initiative and strife. The ethos of business and military blend into each other in the doctrine of perpetual war. A war not merely to fatten defense budgets but to deplete the civilian, for to the Prometheans, populations present themselves as recalcitrant flesh to be disciplined and spiritualized through strife.

#### Alternative – rejecting state-based ideology opens up space for alternative systems

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 4-24-2012, “Occupy Wall Street: what is to be done next?” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/apr/24/occupy-wall-street-what-is-to-be-done-next

Economic globalization is gradually but inexorably undermining the legitimacy of western democracies. Due to their international character, large economic processes cannot be controlled by democratic mechanisms which are, by definition, limited to nation states. In this way, people more and more experience institutional democratic forms as unable to capture their vital interests. It is here that Marx's key insight remains valid, today perhaps more than ever: for Marx, the question of freedom should not be located primarily into the political sphere proper. The key to actual freedom rather resides in the "apolitical" network of social relations, from the market to the family, where the change needed if we want an actual improvement is not a political reform, but a change in the "apolitical" social relations of production. We do not vote about who owns what, about relations in a factory, etc – all this is left to processes outside the sphere of the political. It is illusory to expect that one can effectively change things by "extending" democracy into this sphere, say, by organizing "democratic" banks under people's control. In such "democratic" procedures (which, of course, can have a positive role to play), no matter how radical our anti-capitalism is, the solution is sought in applying the democratic mechanisms – which, one should never forget, are part of the state apparatuses of the "bourgeois" state that guarantees undisturbed functioning of the capitalist reproduction.

### Link – State Solutions

#### Their engagement corrupts our alternatives capacity to shatter existing institutions

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 4-24-2012, “Occupy Wall Street: what is to be done next?” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2012/apr/24/occupy-wall-street-what-is-to-be-done-next

So we should see in this development also a challenge: it is not enough to reject the depoliticized expert rule as the most ruthless form of ideology; one should also begin to think seriously about what to propose instead of the predominant economic organization, to imagine and experiment with alternate forms of organization, to search for the germs of the New. Communism is not just or predominantly the carnival of the mass protest when the system is brought to a halt; Communism is also, above all, a new form of organization, discipline, hard work. The protesters should beware not only of enemies, but also of false friends who pretend to support them, but are already working hard to dilute the protest. In the same way we get coffee without caffeine, beer without alcohol, ice-cream without fat, they will try to make the protests into a harmless moralistic gesture. In boxing, to "clinch" means to hold the opponent's body with one or both arms in order to prevent or hinder punches. Bill Clinton's reaction to the Wall Street protests is a perfect case of political clinching; Clinton thinks that the protests are "on balance … a positive thing", but he is worried about the nebulousness of the cause. Clinton suggested the protesters get behind President Obama's jobs plan, which he claimed would create "a couple million jobs in the next year and a half". What one should resist at this stage is precisely such a quick translation of the energy of the protest into a set of "concrete" pragmatic demands. Yes, the protests did create a vacuum – a vacuum in the field of hegemonic ideology, and time is needed to fill this vacuum in in a proper way, since it is a pregnant vacuum, an opening for the truly New. The reason protesters went out is that they had enough of the world where to recycle your Coke cans, to give a couple of dollars for charity, or to buy Starbucks cappuccino where 1% goes for the third world troubles is enough to make them feel good.

#### Perm supplements the system it does not disturb

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 2008,” In Defense of Lost Causes” p.33

The "worldless" character of capitalism is linked to this hegemonic role of scientific discourse in modernity, a feature clearly identified already by Hegel who wrote that, for us moderns, art and religion no longer obey absolute respect: we can admire them, but we no longer kneel down in front of them, our heart is not really with them —today, only science (conceptual knowledge) deserves this respect. "Postmodernity" as the "end of grand narratives" is one of the names for this predicament in which the multitude of local fictions thrives against the background of scientific discourse as the only remaining universality deprived of sense. Which is why the politics advocated by many a leftist today, that of countering the devastating world-dissolving effect of capitalist moder­ nization by inventing new fictions, imagining "new worlds" (like the Porto Alegre slogan "Another world is possible!"), is inadequate or, at least, profoundly ambiguous: it all depends on how these fictions relate to the underlying Real of capitalism — do they just supplement it with the imaginary multitude, as the postmodern "local narratives" do, or do they disturb its functioning? In other words, the task is to produce a symbolic fiction (a truth) that intervenes into the Real, that causes a change within it.29

#### State focused political change fails

John Holloway, Ph.D Political Science-University of Edinburgh , 8-16-2005, “Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?”, http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616)

At the core of these fissures is the drive to self-determination. And then it is a question of working out what does this mean, and how to be organised for self-determination. It means being against and beyond the society that exists. Of expanding the fissures, how to push these fissures forward structurally. The people who say we should take control of the state are also talking about cracks. There is no choice but to start with interstices. The question is how we think of them, because the state is not the whole world. There are 200 states. If you seize control of one, it is still only a crack in capitalism. It is a question of how we think about those cracks, those fissures. And if we start off from ourselves, why on earth should we adopt capitalist, bourgeois forms for developing our struggle? Why should we accept the template of the concept of the state?

### Link – Experts

#### Reliance on expertise dilutes the revolutions potential

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-25-2011, “Slavoj Žižek speaks at Occupy Wall Street: Q&A transcript,” http://www.imposemagazine.com/bytes/slavoj-zizek-at-occupy-wall-street-transcript

Let me tell you something horrible. We pretend to be leaderless. But then you look closely, and you see often a very tough hierarchic structure, and that we don't even want to admit it's hierarchy. So what I think we need a new figure of a leader who in a way admits that he is no leader. Marx said something wonderful, although wrong, about Abraham Lincoln. Marx said that in the United States, even a totally average person like Lincoln can become the leader. Marx was wrong here about Lincoln. So even an average person like Lincoln was able to do great historical acts. Maybe this is the order that we want. The leader is not anonymous but you don't need a genius to be your leader. Everyone can be [one]. And believe it or not, it can be done. Experts, they should know, but they shouldn't be given power. Power should be given precisely to the average people. If we abandon this principle, we abandon democracy.

#### Current forms of democracy are subjugated by expertise

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-25-2011, “Slavoj Žižek speaks at Occupy Wall Street: Q&A transcript,” http://www.imposemagazine.com/bytes/slavoj-zizek-at-occupy-wall-street-transcript

We got the first glimpse of this new master in Greece and Italy, and Spain will probably follow. As if ironically answering the lack of expert programs of the protesters, the trend is now to replace politicians in the government with a "neutral" government of depoliticized technocrats (mostly bankers, as in Greece and Italy). Colorful "politicians" are out, grey experts are in. This trend is clearly moving towards a permanent emergency state and the suspension of political democracy.

#### The rheotoric of democracy cements social hierarchy causing massive oppression

Lila Rajiva, Masters in Economics, Doctoral work in international relations and political philosophy, 2006, The New Centennial Review 6.1 (2006) 133-169, “Prometheus The Emergence of the Police State in America

Under the rhetoric of democracy and egalitarianism, hierarchy is the reality, a hierarchy in which business elites, technocrats, and their ideologues control the masses with the wand of propaganda (Laughland 2003). Thus, the concept of space becomes central to the Promethean ideology. It is articulated through the ethos of competition and the survival of the fittest, the maintenance of distance between the elites and the masses. Space is the unifying concept in the expansion of the state territorially into the heavens and internally into the psyche. It is also behind the definition of everything outside the state as a lack needing to be remedied or filled, as failed states, regressed cultures, as gaps in order. Into these gaps, whether in the heavens or on earth, the state inserts its rationality through the stealthy monitoring of a robotic technology, which represents the elimination of the human. In so expressing rationality without the inconvenience of undisciplined flesh, the Promethean state articulates the demigod. Sensing its own robot impunity and limitless expansiveness, it arrives at that dangerous [End Page 161] solipsism, reflected in such statements as, "We create our own reality." In a world thus fashioned and driven from within, external constraints become not merely ineffective but irrelevant.

### AT: Perm

#### Starting points are key – their perspective deactivates radical politics

Peter Dickens Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex and James Ormrod, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2007, Cosmic Society: Towards a Sociology of the Universe pg 148

Sociologists should not construct themselves as detached intellectuals, but should make their political commitments clear. Their concerns should be with revealing the suffering that results from social processes that serve the interests of those in power. There is a distinct danger that some fledgling projects to explore the relationship between society and the universe, such as the field of ‘astrosociology’ being developed by Jim Pass (2004), do little but reproduce hegemonic common sense about the benefits of space exploration and development (Ormrod 2005). Although astrosociology may draw public attention to under-researched issues, it will offer nothing if it does not do so critically.

#### Focusing on half solutions destroys all revolutionary potential

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-25-2011, “Slavoj Žižek speaks at Occupy Wall Street: Q&A transcript,” http://www.imposemagazine.com/bytes/slavoj-zizek-at-occupy-wall-street-transcript

Did you see a good Hollywood Marxist movie? John Carpenter's They Live, you know, where a guy finds some strange sunglasses, puts them on, and he sees the true message. For example, you have an advertisement for a Hawaii vacation, you put on the glasses, and what you see is, "Be stupid, enjoy, don't think". So whenever you read the official media, imagine yourself putting these glasses on. I remember seeing, recently, an ad to help starving children in Africa. It said, "For the price of a couple of cappuccinos, you can save this child's life." Let's put the glasses on. What you see is, "For the price of a couple of cappuccinos, we allow you not only no longer to feel guilty but even to feel as if you are really doing something about poverty without really doing anything". We have to get rid of pseudo activities. For example, organic food. It's good to buy, I buy it. But remember what the danger. Is it not true that many of us buy it because it makes you feel good? "Look, I'm doing something to help the mother earth. I'm part of a wonderful project of humanity". You know, it's an easy way out. Charity, for me is not the answer. You know, once I called Soros, George Soros, who I appreciate. As a person he's not bad. I call him chocolate laxative. You know you can buy a laxative which has the form of a chocolate. But chocolate is usually associated with constipation. So, first they take billions from you, then they give you half back, and they are the greatest humanitarians. Of course, we should take this kind of money. But what we should fight for is a society where this kind of charity will not be needed. So I know I didn't answer your question, maybe next time better luck.

#### This is a form of political clinching – destroys all progressive politics

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-26-2011, “Occupy first. Demands come later,” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/oct/26/occupy-protesters-bill-clinton

In boxing, to clinch means to hold the opponent's body with one or both arms in order to prevent or hinder punches. Bill Clinton's reaction to the Wall Street protests is a perfect case of political clinching. Clinton thinks that the protests are "on balance … a positive thing", but he is worried about the nebulousness of the cause: "They need to be for something specific, and not just against something because if you're just against something, someone else will fill the vacuum you create," he said. Clinton suggested the protesters get behind President Obama's jobs plan, which he claimed would create "a couple million jobs in the next year and a half".

### Cap Bad – General

#### Cap causes every problem

Sam Webb, National Chairman , Communist Party USA , 2004 , Sam Webb, People’s Weekly World Newspaper,3-20-04 , http://www.peoplesworld.org/war-capitalism-and-george-w-bush/

We are living in a fragile and unstable world. But perhaps that has always been the lot of humankind – certainly, it is a state of affairs as old as capitalism.Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty.

#### Cap causes environmental destruction, economic collapse, diseases and nuke war

Sam Webb, National Chairman , Communist Party USA , 2004 , Sam Webb, People’s Weekly World Newspaper,3-20-04 , http://www.peoplesworld.org/war-capitalism-and-george-w-bush/

Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead. Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind’s ability to solve these problems. Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation.

#### Cap causes regional wars

Samir Amin, Egyptian economist, a research officer for the government's, 2010, "Institution for economic management ",an adviser to the Ministry of Planning in Bamako (Mali), professor at the university of Poitiers, Dakar and Paris, director of the Third World Forum, 2010, “Ending the Crisis of Capitalism or Ending Capitalism?”

A sudden rupture in ongoing aid - bad as aid is - is not desirable. In fact, it would be a declaration of war aimed at destabilising the existing power order and perhaps even at destroying the state. This is the strategy that sanctions have implemented, and continue to implement, the economic blockades of Cuba and Zimbabwe being good examples.

### Cap Bad – War

#### Capitalism causes war – imperialism, diversionary wars, need for resources

Jonathan Nitzan, teaches political economy at York University in Toronto, Shimshon Bichler teaches political economy at colleges and universities in Israel. Most of their publications are freely available from The Bichler & Nitzan Archives, 11-16-2006, “Capitalism and War,” Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=3890

The recent flurry of wars – from Afghanistan and Iraq to Gaza and Lebanon – has revived talk of imperialism, military Keynesianism and the military-industrial Complex. Capitalism, many radicals have long argued, needs war. It needs it to expand its geographical reach; it needs it to open up new markets; it needs it to access cheap raw materials; and it needs it to placate opposition at home and pacify rebellious populations abroad.1

#### Capitalism produces infinite wars

Jonathan Nitzan, teaches political economy at York University in Toronto, Shimshon Bichler teaches political economy at colleges and universities in Israel. Most of their publications are freely available from The Bichler & Nitzan Archives, 11-16-2006, “Capitalism and War,” Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=3890

For the most part, though, these hybrid theories are misleading. The new conflicts of the twenty-first century – the "infinite wars," the "clashes of civilization," the "new crusades" – are fundamentally different from the "mass wars" and statist military conflicts that characterized capitalism from the nineteenth century until the end of the Cold War. The main difference lies not so much in the military nature of the conflicts, as in the broader role that war plays in capitalism.

#### Capitalist elites produce wars to sustain inflation

Jonathan Nitzan, teaches political economy at York University in Toronto, Shimshon Bichler teaches political economy at colleges and universities in Israel. Most of their publications are freely available from The Bichler & Nitzan Archives, 11-16-2006, “Capitalism and War,” Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=3890

Faced with these predicaments, capitalists generally and dominant capitalists particularly began yearning for a little dose of "healthy" inflation both to avert debt deflation and to kick-start differential accumulation. As it turned out, the solution for their predicament – intended or otherwise – was a new ‘energy conflict’ in the Middle East (that is, a conflict related directly or indirectly to oil). Over the past thirty-five years, these conflicts have been the prime mover of oil prices, and oil prices have provided the spark for broad-based inflation. It was a turnkey mechanism for triggering inflation, and it was read to use. In this sense, military conflict has come to assume a new, roundabout role in the accumulation process. Until the 1950s and 1960s, the main impact of military conflict worked through large military budgets which directly boosted aggregate demand and overall profits, as well as the income of the leading military contractors. But with the re-globalization of ownership and the on-setting of détente, military budgets started to contract. Initially, they fell relatively, as a share of GDP, but since the late 1980s, they also began to drop absolutely, in constant dollar terms. Although these expenditures still nourish the military contractors, their direct effect on capital accumulation has diminished significantly. However, military conflict as such hasn’t lost its appeal; it still has a big impact on accumulation. The novelty is that the impact now works mostly indirectly, through inflation, relative prices and redistribution.

### Cap Bad – Resource Wars

#### Cap causes resource wars and environmental collapse

Samir Amin, Egyptian economist, a research officer for the government's, 2010, "Institution for economic management ",an adviser to the Ministry of Planning in Bamako (Mali), professor at the university of Poitiers, Dakar and Paris, director of the Third World Forum, 2010, “Ending the Crisis of Capitalism or Ending Capitalism?”

There are key questions concerning both the use that an economic and social system makes of the natural resources of the planet and the philosophical conception of the relationships between human beings (and within society) on the one hand, and between humans and nature on the other. The response to these questions that a society has given in the past describes the rationality that governs its economic and social management. Historically, capitalism has mainly ignored these considerations. It established a strictly economic rationality with a short-term vision ('the depreciation of the future') and was based on the principle that natural resources are generally put at the free disposal of society and, what is more, in unlimited quantities. The only exception is when certain resources are privately appropriated, as the land or mining resources, but subordinating their utilisation to the exclusive requirements of the profitability for capital, which exploits the potential. The rationality of this system is therefore narrow and becomes socially irrational as soon as these resources become scarce, even exhausted, or when their usage, in the forms imposed by the economic profitability of capitalism.

#### Cap causes resource war

Samir Amin, Egyptian economist, a research officer for the government's, 2010, "Institution for economic management ",an adviser to the Ministry of Planning in Bamako (Mali), professor at the university of Poitiers, Dakar and Paris, director of the Third World Forum, 2010, “Ending the Crisis of Capitalism or Ending Capitalism?”

We are now in a new phase of history in which conflicts about access to the natural resources of the planet are becoming more acute. The Triad means to reserve exclusive access to this 'useful' Africa (that of the reserves of natural resources) for itself and to prohibit access to the emerging countries whose needs in this field are great and will no doubt increase. The guarantee of exclusive access is obtained through political control and reducing African countries to client states.

#### Cap causes war

Fred Goldstein, staff writer, 10-9-2008, “Capitalism breeds war, depression,” Workers World, http://www.workers.org/2008/us/capitalism\_1016/

In the 110 years since the Spanish-American war of conquest, imperialist capitalism has brought an endless cycle of wars, recessions, depressions and more wars. After each economic downturn, the system has had to resort to military expansion and financial manipulation to revive itself. During the depression of the 1930s, Franklin D. Roosevelt tried to get the economy going with the Works Project Administration and by allowing workers’ wages to rise. But by 1937-1938, after a brief uptick, there was a second depression. Only preparations for World War II and conquest in the Pacific and Europe revived the U.S. economy. Throughout the entire Cold War period, U.S. capitalism was dependent on military spending to keep its economy going. The growth of the military-industrial complex, with its web of prime contractors and tens of thousands of subcontractors thriving on Pentagon appropriations for war and for arms exports, was the principal means of keeping the capitalist economy from sinking into stagnation and depression. This history illustrates that since the turn of the twentieth century, capitalism, in order to sustain itself, has had to resort to artificial measures that bring disaster in their wake, in the form of war, depression or both.

### Cap Bad – Environment

#### Capitalism destroys the environment

Victor Wallis, Professor of Liberal Arts at Berkeley, “Beyond “green capitalism”, February 2010, http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism

A disdain for the natural environment has characterized capitalism from the beginning. As Marx noted, capital abuses the soil as much as it exploits the worker.1 The makings of ecological breakdown are thus inherent in capitalism. No serious observer now denies the severity of the environmental crisis, but it is still not widely recognized as a capitalist crisis, that is, as a crisis arising from and perpetuated by the rule of capital, and hence incapable of resolution within the capitalist framework.

#### Cap causes over exploitation of resources

Victor Wallis, Professor of Liberal Arts at Berkeley, “Beyond “green capitalism”, February 2010, http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism

It is useful to remind ourselves that, although Marx situated capitalism’s crisis tendencies initially in the business cycle (specifically, in its downward phase), he recognized at the same time that those tendencies could manifest themselves under other forms—the first of these being the drive to global expansion.2 Such manifestations are not inherently cyclical; they are permanent trends. They can be sporadically offset, but for as long as capitalism prevails, they cannot be reversed. They encompass: (1) increased concentration of economic power; (2) increased polarization between rich and poor, both within and across national boundaries; (3) a permanent readiness for military engagement in support of these drives; and (4) of special concern to us here, the uninterrupted debasement or depletion of vital natural resources.

#### Capitalism makes environmental destruction and extinction inevitable

John Bellamy Foster, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, November 2009, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction”, http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction

Behind this tragedy-cum-farce is a distorted accounting deeply rooted in the workings of the system that sees wealth entirely in terms of value generated through exchange. In such a system, only commodities for sale on the market really count. External nature — water, air, living species — outside this system of exchange is viewed as a “free gift.” Once such blinders have been put on, it is possible to speak, as the leading U.S. climate economist William Nordhaus has, of the relatively unhindered growth of the economy a century or so from now, under conditions of business as usual — despite the fact that leading climate scientists see following the identical path over the same time span as absolutely catastrophic both for human civilization and life on the planet as a whole.1

### Cap Bad – Environment

#### Capitalism kills the environment

John Bellamy Foster, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, November 2009, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction”, http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction

In the Oh shit era, the debate, McKibben says, is over. There is no longer any doubt that global warming represents a crisis of earth-shaking proportions. Yet, it is absolutely essential to understand that this is only one part of what we call the environmental crisis. The global ecological threat as a whole is made up of a large number of interrelated crises and problems that are confronting us simultaneously. In my 1994 book, The Vulnerable Planet, I started out with a brief litany of some of these, to which others might now be added:Overpopulation, destruction of the ozone layer, global warming, extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, acid rain, nuclear contamination, tropical deforestation, the elimination of climax forests, wetland destruction, soil erosion, desertification, floods, famine, the despoliation of lakes, streams, and rivers, the drawing down and contamination of ground water, the pollution of coastal waters and estuaries, the destruction of coral reefs, oil spills, overfishing, expanding landfills, toxic wastes, the poisonous effects of insecticides and herbicides, exposure to hazards on the job, urban congestion, and the depletion of nonrenewable resources.11The poinst is that not just global warming but many of these other problems as well can each be seen as constituting a global ecological crisis. Today every major ecosystem on the earth is in decline. Issues of environmental justice are becoming more prominent and pressing everywhere we turn. Underlying this is the fact that the class/imperial war that defines capitalism as a world system, and that governs its system of accumulation, is a juggernaut that knows no limits. In this deadly conflict the natural world is seen as a mere instrument of world social domination. Hence, capital by its very logic imposes what is in effect a scorched earth strategy. The planetary ecological crisis is increasingly all-encompassing, a product of the destructive uncontrollability of a rapidly globalizing capitalist economy, which knows no law other than its own drive to exponential expansion.

#### Cap makes ecological destruction inevitable

John Bellamy Foster, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, November 2009, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction”, http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction

In fact, a new historical period had emerged in the ten years since the Rio summit. Economically, the world had witnessed what Paul Sweezy in 1994 called “the triumph of financial capitalism” with the transformation of monopoly capital into what might be called global monopoly-finance capital.5 By the end of the twentieth century capitalism had evolved into a system that was if anything more geared to rapacious accumulation than ever before, relatively independent from its local and national roots. Global financial expansion was occurring on top of a world economy that was stagnating at the level of production, creating a more unstable and more viciously inegalitarian order, dominated by neoliberal economics and financial bubbles. Declining U.S. hegemony in the world system, coupled with the demise of the Soviet Union, induced repeated and increasingly naked U.S. attempts to restore its economic and political power by military means. Meanwhile, global warming and other crucial environmental problems had crossed critical thresholds. The question was no longer whether ecological and social catastrophes awaited but how great these would be. For those (including myself) in Johannesburg in 2002, watching the U.S. president prepare for war in the petroleum-rich Persian Gulf while the planet was heating up from the burning of fossil fuels, the whole world seemed on fire.

### Cap Bad – Warming

#### Capitalism causes global warming

Dudi Cohen, Ynetnews publisher, 6-10-2011, http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4080306,00.html

Iranian president accuses West of disrupting balance of nature by intensifying excessive consumption, creating false demands to gain profit Has the green revolution reached Tehran? Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad accused western capitalism of destroying the environment on Thursday. In a meeting with environment officials from the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), Ahmadinejad said: “The main factor behind the destruction of the environment is the greed and the ceaseless avarice and insatiable hunger of the world's capitalists." Dismissing claims that human progress and promotion of lifestyle is to blame for the world's environmental crises, he added: “The world's capitalists, through intensifying excessive consumption and even the creation of false demands with the aim of maximum profits, disrupt the balance of nature." Iran, Turkey and Pakistan founded the ECO in 1985 and the organization now includes seven other states. The Iranian president expressed hope that the ECO could pressure the world's major sources of pollutions to change their policies. "The capitalist establishment and the world's major capitalists, the US in particular, only seek maximum profits and to further reduce the cost of their products, they built production lines that are not compatible with the environment," he said. Ahamdinejad further added that two or three countries account for half of the world's pollution.

#### Cap destroys the environment – causes extinction

Samir Amin, Director of the Third World Forum, 2008, The World We Wish to See, p. 33

It [capitalism] also leads to the rapid exhaustion of non-renewable resources, the accelerated destruction of biodiversity and the exacerbation of the threats that strongly affect the ecological balances that are essential for the reproduction of life on earth. Incontestable quantified data exist which demonstrate that capitalist civilization cannot continue its destructive expansion for long. Preserving the way of life of the United States alone would lead to pillaging all of the resources of the planet for its sole benefit. The energy crisis has already produced military aggression in the Middle East. “The American way of life is not negotiable,” the president of this country reminds us. In other words, the extermination of the “redskins,” who hinder U.S. expansion, will be continued.

#### Runaway warming will happen—not acting is gambling with our whole existence

ECES, 2002, ”documenting the collapse of a dying planet”, Earth crash earth spirit <http://eces.org/ec/globalwarming/oceans.shtml#090301>, 8/11/03

The vast majority of the world's climate scientists agree that global warming is now occurring on Earth due to the release of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere by the burning of fossil fuels and other human activities. It is not certain that the present global warming will "runaway" and cause a catastrophic climate change such as that which has made Venus uninhabitable, but, as is discussed in the articles below, it is considered a possibility. The question is, do we want to play what is basically a form of Russian roulette with life on Earth by contining to pour greenhouse gases into the atmosphere on the gamble that runaway global warming won't happen?

### Cap Bad – Genocide

#### Cap causes genocides

Samir Amin, Egyptian economist, a research officer for the government's, 2010, "Institution for economic management ",an adviser to the Ministry of Planning in Bamako (Mali), professor at the university of Poitiers, Dakar and Paris, director of the Third World Forum, 2010, “Ending the Crisis of Capitalism or Ending Capitalism?”

We have therefore reached the point when, to open up a new field for the expansion of capital (the modernisation of agricultural production), it is necessary to destroy - in human terms entire societies. Fifty million new efficient producers (200 million human beings with their families) on the one hand, three billion excluded people on the other. The creative aspect of the operation would be only a drop of water in the ocean of destruction it requires. I thus conclude that capitalism has entered into its phase of declining senility: the logic of the system is no longer able to ensure the simple survival of humanity. Capitalism is becoming barbaric and leads directly to genocide. It is more than ever necessary to replace it with another development logic which is more rational.

#### Genocide is the ultimate impact – it makes both life and death meaningless

Claudia Card, Philosophy Prof @ U of Wisconsin-Madison. "Genocide and Social Death," Hypatia, Vol.18, Iss. 1 2003

Yet such atrocities, it may be argued, are already war crimes, if conducted during wartime, and they can otherwise or also be prosecuted as crimes against humanity. Why, then, add the specific crime of genocide? What, if anything, is not already captured by laws that prohibit such things as the rape, enslavement, torture, forced deportation, and the degradation of individuals? Is any ethically distinct harm done to members of the targeted group that would not have been done had they been targeted simply as individuals rather than because of their group membership? This is the question that I find central in arguing that genocide is not simply reducible to mass death, to any of the other war crimes, or to the crimes against humanity just enumerated. I believe the answer is affirmative: the harm is ethically distinct, although on the question of whether it is worse, I wish only to question the assumption that it is not. Specific to genocide is the harm inflicted on its victims' social vitality. It is not just that one's group membership is the occasion for harms that are definable independently of one's identity as a member of the group. When a group with its own cultural identity is destroyed, its survivors lose their cultural heritage and may even lose their intergenerational connections. To use Orlando Patterson's terminology, in that event, they may become "socially dead" and their descendants "natally alienated," no longer able to pass along and build upon the traditions, cultural developments (including languages), and projects of earlier generations (1982, 5-9). The harm of social death is not necessarily less extreme than that of physical death. Social death can even aggravate physical death by making it indecent, removing all respectful and caring ritual, social connections, and social contexts that are capable of making dying bearable and even of making one's death meaningful. In my view, the special evil of genocide lies in its infliction of not just physical death (when it does that) but social death, producing a consequent meaninglessness of one's life and even of its termination. This view, however, is controversial.

### AT: Cap Good

#### There is no pure capitalism – the current system functions through state intervention

Nicole Jones, Staff Writer, 11-11-2011, “Žižek On Occupy Wall Street And Future Alternatives,” PBH, http://www.prosebeforehos.com/article-of-the-day/11/11/zizek-on-occupy-wall-street-and-future-alternatives/

One of the good results of this crisis is that neo-liberalism, for reasonable people, is dead. We are becoming aware not only that it doesn’t work but that, let’s be clear, there never even was neoliberalism. Like, what neoliberalism? Already with Reagan, Bush, the state is growing stronger and stronger, intervening all the time. I really think it’s a total misperception that we live in some kind of a wild capitalist neoliberal universe. No. I think this is the first thing maybe that we should do. To note how we are already entering a new type of organized capitalism which is no longer liberal capitalism, and which more and more relies on strong state interventions.

### Collapse Inevitable

#### Collapse is inevitable – finite planet

David Graeber, assistant prof of anthropology yale, 2008, “hope in common” http://www.anarchistnews.org/?q=node/5531

We seem to have reached an impasse. Capitalism as we know it appears to be coming apart. But as financial institutions stagger and crumble, there is no obvious alternative. Organized resistance appears scattered and incoherent; the global justice movement a shadow of its former self. There is good reason to believe that, in a generation or so, capitalism will no longer exist: for the simple reason that it’s impossible to maintain an engine of perpetual growth forever on a finite planet. Faced with the prospect, the knee-jerk reaction—even of “progressives”—is, often, fear, to cling to capitalism because they simply can’t imagine an alternative that wouldn’t be even worse. The first question we should be asking is: How did this happen? Is it normal for human beings to be unable to imagine what a better world would even be like? Hopelessness isn’t natural. It needs to be produced. If we really want to understand this situation, we have to begin by understanding that the last thirty years have seen the construction of a vast bureaucratic apparatus for the creation and maintenance of hopelessness, a kind of giant machine that is designed, first and foremost, to destroy any sense of possible alternative futures. At root is a veritable obsession on the part of the rulers of the world with ensuring that social movements cannot be seen to grow, to flourish, to propose alternatives; that those who challenge existing power arrangements can never, under any circumstances, be perceived to win.

#### Collapse is inevitable – get behind the revolution

David Graeber, assistant prof of anthropology yale, 2008, “hope in common” http://www.anarchistnews.org/?q=node/5531

We are clearly at the verge of another mass resurgence of the popular imagination. It shouldn’t be that difficult. Most of the elements are already there. The problem is that, our perceptions having been twisted into knots by decades of relentless propaganda, we are no longer able to see them. Consider here the term “communism.” 8z has a term come to be so utterly reviled. The standard line, which we accept more or less unthinkingly, is that communism means state control of the economy, and this is an impossible utopian dream because history has shown it simply “doesn’t work.” Capitalism, however unpleasant, is thus the only remaining option. But in fact communism really just means any situation where people act according to the principle of “from each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs”—which is the way pretty much everyone always act if they are working together to get something done. If two people are fixing a pipe and one says “hand me the wrench,” the other doesn’t say, “and what do I get for it?”(That is, if they actually want it to be fixed.) This is true even if they happen to be employed by Bechtel or Citigroup. They apply principles of communism because it’s the only thing that really works. This is also the reason whole cities or countries revert to some form of rough-and-ready communism in the wake of natural disasters, or economic collapse (one might say, in those circumstances, markets and hierarchical chains of command are luxuries they can’t afford.) The more creativity is required, the more people have to improvise at a given task, the more egalitarian the resulting form of communism is likely to be: that’s why even Republican computer engineers, when trying to innovate new software ideas, tend to form small democratic collectives. It’s only when work becomes standardized and boring—as on production lines—that it becomes possible to impose more authoritarian, even fascistic forms of communism. But the fact is that even private companies are, internally, organized communistically. Communism then is already here. The question is how to further democratize it. Capitalism, in turn, is just one possible way of managing communism—and, it has become increasingly clear, rather a disastrous one.

#### Collapse is coming

Immanuel Wallerstein, senior research scholar at Yale, “The Global Economy Won’t Recover, Now or Ever,” January-February 2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\_wisdom?page=0,9,

All systems have lives. When their processes move too far from equilibrium, they fluctuate chaotically and bifurcate. Our existing system, what I call a capitalist world-economy, has been in existence for some 500 years and has for at least a century encompassed the entire globe. It has functioned remarkably well. But like all systems, it has moved steadily further and further from equilibrium. For a while now, it has moved too far from equilibrium, such that it is today in structural crisis.

### Collapse Inevitable

#### Price dynamics makes collapse inevitable

Immanuel Wallerstein, senior research scholar at Yale, “The Global Economy Won’t Recover, Now or Ever,” January-February 2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\_wisdom?page=0,9,

The problem is that the basic costs of all production have risen remarkably. There are the personnel expenses of all kinds -- for unskilled workers, for cadres, for top-level management. There are the costs incurred as producers pass on the costs of their production to the rest of us -- for detoxification, for renewal of resources, for infrastructure. And the democratization of the world has led to demands for more and more education, more and more health provisions, and more and more guarantees of lifetime income. To meet these demands, there has been a significant increase in taxation of all kinds. Together, these costs have risen beyond the point that permits serious capital accumulation. Why not then simply raise prices? Because there are limits beyond which one cannot push their level. It is called the elasticity of demand. The result is a growing profit squeeze, which is reaching a point where the game is not worth the candle. What we are witnessing as a result is chaotic fluctuations of all kinds -- economic, political, sociocultural. These fluctuations cannot easily be controlled by public policy. The result is ever greater uncertainty about all kinds of short-term decision-making, as well as frantic realignments of every variety. Doubt feeds on itself as we search for ways out of the menacing uncertainty posed by terrorism, climate change, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation. The only sure thing is that the present system cannot continue.

#### Not a question of if but what will replace capitalism

Immanuel Wallerstein, senior research scholar at Yale, “The Global Economy Won’t Recover, Now or Ever,” January-February 2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\_wisdom?page=0,9,

The fundamental political struggle is over what kind of system will replace capitalism, not whether it should survive. The choice is between a new system that replicates some of the present system's essential features of hierarchy and polarization and one that is relatively democratic and egalitarian.

#### Prefer our evidence – their authors bury their heads in the sands

Immanuel Wallerstein, senior research scholar at Yale, “The Global Economy Won’t Recover, Now or Ever,” January-February 2011, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\_wisdom?page=0,9,

The extraordinary expansion of the world-economy in the postwar years (more or less 1945 to 1970) has been followed by a long period of economic stagnation in which the basic source of gain has been rank speculation sustained by successive indebtednesses. The latest financial crisis didn't bring down this system; it merely exposed it as hollow. Our recent "difficulties" are merely the next-to-last bubble in a process of boom and bust the world-system has been undergoing since around 1970. The last bubble will be state indebtednesses, including in the so-called emerging economies, leading to bankruptcies. Most people do not recognize -- or refuse to recognize -- these realities. It is wrenching to accept that the historical system in which we are living is in structural crisis and will not survive. Meanwhile, the system proceeds by its accepted rules. We meet at G-20 sessions and seek a futile consensus. We speculate on the markets. We "develop" our economies in whatever way we can. All this activity simply accentuates the structural crisis. The real action, the struggle over what new system will be created, is elsewhere.

### Alt Solvency

#### Refusal to outsource engagement creates revolutionary change

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-26-2011, “Occupy first. Demands come later,” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/oct/26/occupy-protesters-bill-clinton

The reason protesters went out is that they had enough of the world where recycling your Coke cans, giving a couple of dollars to charity, or buying a cappuccino where 1% goes towards developing world troubles, is enough to make them feel good. After outsourcing work and torture, after the marriage agencies started to outsource even our dating, they saw that for a long time they were also allowing their political engagements to be outsourced – and they want them back.

#### Radical demands alone cracks the system

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-26-2011, “Occupy first. Demands come later,” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/oct/26/occupy-protesters-bill-clinton

The art of politics is also to insist on a particular demand that, while thoroughly "realist", disturbs the very core of the hegemonic ideology: ie one that, while definitely feasible and legitimate, is de facto impossible (universal healthcare in the US was such a case). In the aftermath of the Wall Street protests, we should definitely mobilise people to make such demands – however, it is no less important to simultaneously remain subtracted from the pragmatic field of negotiations and "realist" proposals.

#### The left is unified around the alts mechanism

Nicole Jones, Staff Writer, 11-11-2011, “Žižek On Occupy Wall Street And Future Alternatives,” PBH, http://www.prosebeforehos.com/article-of-the-day/11/11/zizek-on-occupy-wall-street-and-future-alternatives/

I do [sense] a readiness to question the fundamentals of the system. Even with radical liberal leftists, it was [formerly] within the existing system: less racism, more freedom to women, abortion, divorce. The basic insight I see is that clearly for the first time, the underlying perception there is a flaw in the system as such. It’s not just the question of making the system better.

### Alt Solvency

#### Creating the foundation for the revolution is key

Nicole Jones, Staff Writer, 11-11-2011, “Žižek On Occupy Wall Street And Future Alternatives,” PBH, http://www.prosebeforehos.com/article-of-the-day/11/11/zizek-on-occupy-wall-street-and-future-alternatives/

Just two things. On the one hand, at this point more important than asking is to think, to organize, to lay down the foundations for some kind of a network so that this will not just be a kind of magic explosion that disappears. And point two, the way to start to think about doing something is to select some very specific issues — the model should be the health-care bill — which in a way are very realistic.

#### New alternatives are opening up

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 11-13-2011, “Slavoj Zizek: Capitalism with Asian values,” AlJezzera, http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/talktojazeera/2011/10/2011102813360731764.html

In his distinct and colourful manner, he analyses the Arab Spring, the eurozone crisis, the "Occupy Wall Street" movement and the rise of China. Concerned about the future of the existing western democratic capitalism Zizek believes that the current "system has lost its self-evidence, its automatic legitimacy, and now the field is open." "I think today the world is asking for a real alternative. Would you like to live in a world where the only alternative is either anglo-saxon neoliberalism or Chinese-Singaporean capitalism with Asian values? I claim if we do nothing we will gradually approach a kind of a new type of authoritarian society. Here I see the world historical importance of what is happening today in China. Until now there was one good argument for capitalism: sooner or later it brought a demand for democracy...

#### Rejection opens up space – incorporating the state destroys change

John Holloway, Ph.D Political Science-University of Edinburgh , 8-16-2005, “Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?”, http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/5616)

in the question of fissures. We often feel helpless because capitalism weighs so heavily on us. But when we say No we start off with an appreciation of our own strength. When we rebel we are in fact tearing a little hole in capitalism. It is very contradictory. By rebelling we are already saying no to the command of capital. We are creating temporary spaces. Within that crack, that fissure, it is important that we fight for other social relations that don't point towards the state, but that they point towards the sort of society we want to create.

### AT: Cede the Political

#### Maintaining a lack of goals is key to the revolution

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-26-2011, “Occupy first. Demands come later,” Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/oct/26/occupy-protesters-bill-clinton

What one should always bear in mind is that any debate here and now necessarily remains a debate on enemy's turf; time is needed to deploy the new content. All we say now can be taken from us – everything except our silence. This silence, this rejection of dialogue, of all forms of clinching, is our "terror", ominous and threatening as it should be.

#### The current political system is suicidal – stepping outside it is key

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-25-2011, “Slavoj Žižek speaks at Occupy Wall Street: Q&A transcript,” http://www.imposemagazine.com/bytes/slavoj-zizek-at-occupy-wall-street-transcript

Do not allow the enemy to set your agenda. That if they say, "sacrifice, work", we should just say "No, freedom, enjoyment". We should take from the enemy their own tools. Think about family values. Many left liberals react to those who defend family values by criticizing family as a conservative insitution and so on. But should we not say, "The neo-liberal economics did much more to destroy family values than all the alternative cultures put together"? It's the same with private property. We should make clear to the people that we don't have a well-functioning system which for some irrational reasons we are trying to destroy. The system is destroying itself. So we are not against democracy. We are observing how democracy, in its present political form, is gradually undermining itself. And it's a very difficult task but there is hope. You here are the hope because you know Herbert Marcuse, the old leftist, who said something very nice: "Freedom is a condition of liberation". That is to say, to be engaged in fighting for freedom, you have first to free yourself from the chains of ruling ideology.

#### Current political agonism reproduces the affs harms

Slavoj Zizek, Philosopher, 10-25-2011, “Slavoj Žižek speaks at Occupy Wall Street: Q&A transcript,” http://www.imposemagazine.com/bytes/slavoj-zizek-at-occupy-wall-street-transcript

Americans have long been divided by the two-party system that pits us against each other over emotional issues, like gay rights, abortion. This is a divide-and-conquer strategy. If we don't let go of our differences, we'll keep butting our heads together while corporatism and the military industrial complex gut our democracy. Americans need to come together. I agree with what the lady said but I prefer to put it in a more combative way. The divisions that the lady mentioned, I agree with her, are false divisions. These false divisions are here to cover up the true divisions and where the true enemies are. We need even more […?]. So let's all come together, but to fight the real enemy. When I visit another country, I am not interested in their culture—this is for UNESCO and official representatives. I'm interested in their struggles. Solidarity is not "Oh my God, we are all parts of the same great humanity". Solidarity means we are part of the same struggle. [Break for mic check: two waves of crowd echo are being used for amplication at the moment]. You know, if I were to be CIA, I would have corrupted someone like you, to change it and censor it in a slightly different way [with each echo].

## Ideology K

### 1NC Ideology Kritik 1/2

#### The expansion of transportation infrastructure is always coopted for the benefits of elites – don’t buy the affirmative’s claim to benign justifications

Death By Car, 9-29-2011, “Shove Affair,” http://www.deathbycar.info/tag/eisenhower/

Mainstream history insists that the United States got cars-first transportation because the people spontaneously demanded it. The masses saw the automobile, and insisted on re-building the nation to facilitate it. “Americans are having a love affair with the car,” so the story goes, is all anybody needs to know about the origins of the present. But here’s the thing: The peddlers of this tale never provide any serious evidence that this is how things actually happened. Why is that? Here at DbC, we hold that the reason nobody provides details in support of the “love affair” thesis is that it is impossible to do so, since popular demand has never, in fact, been the leading force in the shaping of transportation policy and infrastructure in America. All along, the actual reality has been corporate capitalist dictation of such policy and infrastructure. Consider, for instance, the words of Lucius D. Clay, “Eisenhower’s man” in the effort to ram through funding for the Interstate Highway System in the mid-1950s. Clay, at the time a member of General Motors’ Board of Directors, explained his actions as follows: We are indeed a nation on wheels and we cannot permit these wheels to slow down. Our mass industries must have moving supply lines to feed raw materials into our factories and moving distribution lines to carry the finished product to store or home. Moreover, the hands which produce these goods and the services which make them useful must also move from home to factory to store to home. Our highway system has helped make this possible. To me, the importance to the national economy of this modern highway system outweighs all other reasons why it should be built. All I can say is that 10 years from now we’ll have 80 million motor vehicles-and we better have the roads. Because if we don’t have the roads, we may not have the 80 million vehicles. And that, I think, would be very unfortunate for the whole country. If we don’t build the roads, we may not have the cars. Hardly the words of somebody operating in a situation where the masses are clamoring for more automobiles, is it?

#### Resist the affirmative’s call to “do something” – this is just a way to justify status quo ideology

Adria Johnston, research fellow at Emory, December 2004, Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society, v. 9, i. 3, p. 259

The height of Zizek's philosophical traditionalism, his fidelity to certain lasting truths too precious to cast away in a postmodern frenzy, is his conviction that no worthwhile praxis can emerge prior to the careful and deliberate formulation of a correct conceptual framework. His references to the Lacanian notion of the Act (qua agent-less occurrence not brought about by a subject) are especially strange in light of the fact that he seemingly endorses the view that theory must precede practice, namely, that deliberative reflection is, in a way, primary. For Zizek, the foremost "practical" task to be accomplished today isn't some kind of rebellious acting out, which would, in the end, amount to nothing more than a series of impotent, incoherent outbursts. Instead, given the contemporary exhaustion of the socio-political imagination under the hegemony of liberal-democratic capitalism, he sees the liberation of thinking itself from its present constraints as the first crucial step that must be taken if anything is to be changed for the better. In a lecture given in Vienna in 2001, Zizek suggests that Marx's call to break out of the sterile closure of abstract intellectual ruminations through direct, concrete action (thesis eleven on Feuerbach--"The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it") must be inverted given the new prevailing conditions of late-capitalism. Nowadays, one must resist succumbing to the temptation to short-circuit thinking in favor of acting, since all such rushes to action are doomed; they either fail to disrupt capitalism or are ideologically co-opted by it.

### 1NC Ideology Kritik 2/2

#### We’re at the endgame – unchecked growth will cause extinction, and no reform to ideology can save us. The only way out is full-blown revolution.

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, p. 5-6

As the world, or to be more exact, the Western, industrial world, has leapt into a prosperity unimaginable to prior generations, it has prepared for itself a calamity far more unimaginable still. The present world system in effect has had three decades to limit its growth, and it has failed so abjectly that even the idea of limiting growth has been banished from official discourse. Further, it has been proved decisively that the internal logic of the present system translates ‘growth’ into increasing wealth for the few and increasing misery for the many. We must begin our inquiry therefore, with the chilling fact that ‘growth’ so conceived means the destruction of the natural foundation of civilization. If the world were a living organism, then any sensible observer would conclude that this ‘growth’ is a cancer that, if not somehow treated, means the destruction of human society, and even raises the question of the extinction of our species. A simple extrapolation tells us as much, once we learn that the growth is uncontrollable. The details are important and interesting, but less so than the chief conclusion — that irresistible growth, and the evident fact that this growth destabilizes and breaks down the natural ground necessary for human existence, means, in the plainest terms, that we are doomed under the present social order, and that we had better change it as soon as possible if we are to survive. One wants to scream out this brutal and plain truth, which should be on the masthead of every newspaper and the station-identification of every media outlet, the leading issue before Congress and all governmental organ­izations, the focus of every congregation and the centrepiece of every curriculum at all levels of education ... but is nothing of the kind.

#### Our alternative is to do nothing – this is essential to resist capitalism and avoid replicating the aff’s harms

Zizek**,** 2004 Slavoj Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle, page 71-71

The stance of simply condemning the postmodern Left for its accommodation, however, is also false, since one should ask the obvious difficult question: what, in fact, was the alternative? If today’s ‘post-politics’ is opportunistic pragmatism with no principles, then the predominant leftist reaction to it can be aptly characterized as ‘principle opportunism’: one simply sticks to old formulae (defence of the welfare state, and so on) and calls them ‘principles’, dispensing with the detailed analysis of how the situation has changed – and thus retaining one’s position of Beautiful Soul. The inherent stupidity of the ‘principled’ Left is clearly discernable in it standard criticism of any analysis which proposes a more complex picture of the situation, renouncing any simple prescriptions on how to act: ‘there is no clear political stance involved in your theory’ – and this from people with no stance but their ‘principled opportunism’. Against such a stance, one should have the courage to affirm that, in a situation like today’s, the only way really to remain open to a revolutionary opportunity is to renounce facile calls to direct action, which necessarily involve us in an activity where things change so that the totality remains the same. Today’s predicament is that, if we succumb to the urge of directly ‘doing something’ (engaging in the anti-globalist struggle, helping the poor…) we will certainly and undoubtedly contribute to the reproduction of the existing order. The only way to lay the foundations for a true, radical change is to withdraw from the compulsion to act, to ‘do nothing’ – thus opening up the space for a different kind of activity.

### Ideology Link – Transportation

#### History proves the extension of government into transportation infrastructure is used to further militaristic capitalism

J.F. Garcia III, PhD, 2012, “The Capitalist Economies,” http://personal.ashland.edu/~jgarcia/cap.htm

We have never seen a pure version of the system anywhere in history, nor are we likely to. Probably the closest to pure market capitalism ever seen were the U.S. and British economies in the middle to late 19th century. They represented the culmination of a historical line of development that, originating in the murky mists of time, formed a coherent system in the 1200's in northern Italy and Flanders with the invention of modern accounting and mass urbanization, and transformed itself into a dominating structure with the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain in the late 18th century. But even at its apogee in the 19th century, governments intervened in many ways, from trade protectionism to subsidizing. The building of transportation infrastructure to maintaining military forces. Those economies exhibited both the virtues and difficulties of unfettered market capitalism. They experienced enormous technological advances and growth as they underwent the Industrial Revolution. Even those critics of market capitalism, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, recognized the enormous ability of the system to "revolutionize the means of production" in ways unprecedented in world history.

#### Transportation infrastructure is a tool of capitalist exploitation

Death By Car, 4-5-2012, “The Dave Beck Project,” http://www.deathbycar.info/tag/eisenhower/

Mainstream dogma paints cars-first transportation in the United States as a product of pristine popular democracy. It is a huge lie, an attempt to divert attention from actual history. One very interesting aspect of the actual history is the connection between sponsored right-wing labor unions and the imposition of cars-first infrastructure. Take the case of Dave Beck, the President of the Teamsters union who preceded the infamous Jimmy Hoffa. When Eisenhower asked his old buddy Lucius Clay to head a Presidential Commission to organize automotive-industrial capitalists to ram through the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, Clay appointed five cronies to what quickly became known as the Clay Committee.

#### Emphasis on cars feeds capitalism – they’re a tool of the rich

Death By Car, 5-29-2012, “More on Class and Cars,” http://www.deathbycar.info

One of the many Big Lies that sustain corporate capitalism in the United States is the long-running falsehood that cars are essentially egalitarian. Cars-first transportation “unites us across class, racial, ethnic, and religious lines as few other aspects of our society can,” is how Rutgers University transportation engineer James A. Dunn formulates this standard claim. As DbC has noted before, the facts are immensely against this familiar incantation, not only (and most importantly) on the business-income side of the matter, but also in the realm of actual automobile usage. Today, we pause to note one important aspect of the stratification of reality on the usage side — the telling divergence between interest rates on loans for buying new and used cars. Automotive News reports on Experian’s latest findings about trends in car loans between the first quarters of 2011 and 2012. In that time: Interest rates fell, on average, by 0.27 percentage points to 4.56 percent for new cars and by 0.06 points to 9.02 percent for used cars. So, used car loan rates are about double, and decline less easily than, rates on new car loans. Such numbers, of course, reflect the fact that, for the rich, cars are power toys purchased with cash; for the working comfortable, they are luxuries purchased with easy credit; and for the real social middle, they are hand-me-downs bought from extreme usurers. The poor, as always, scrounge for scraps.

### Ideology Link – Law

#### Reliance on the law guarantees the rapid spread of capitalism.

Internationalist Perspective, Spring 2000, “Capitalism and Genocide”, #36, Accessed 4/29/09, http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html

The real domination of capital is characterized by the penetration of the law of value into every segment of social existence. As Georg Lukács put it in his History and Class Consciousness, this means that the commodity ceases to be "one form among many regulating the metabolism of human society," to become its "universal structuring principle." From its original locus at the point of production, in the capitalist factory, which is the hallmark of the formal domination of capital, the law of value has systematically spread its tentacles to incorporate not just the production of commodities, but their circulation and consumption. Moreover, the law of value also penetrates and then comes to preside over the spheres of the political and ideological, including science and technology themselves. This latter occurs not just through the transformation of the fruits of technology and science into commodities, not just through the transformation of technological and scientific research itself (and the institutions in which it takes place) into commodities, but also, and especially, through what Lukács designates as the infiltration of thought itself by the purely technical, the very quantification of rationality, the instrumentalization of reason; and, I would argue, the reduction of all beings (including human beings) to mere objects of manipulation and control. As Lukács could clearly see even in the age of Taylorism, "this rational mechanisation extends right into the worker's `soul'." In short, it affects not only his outward behavior, but her very internal, psychological, makeup.

#### Relying on the rule of law makes capitalism stronger than ever.

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher University of Ljubljana, October 1997, New Left Review, Accessed 4/29/09, http://newleftreview.org/?getpdf=NLR22102

Nonetheless, the post-Nation-State logic of capital remains the Real which lurks in the background, while all three main leftist reactions to the process of globalization—liberal multiculturalism; the attempt to embrace populism by way of discerning, beneath its fundamentalist appearance, the resistance against ‘instrumental reason’; the attempt to keep open the space of the political—seem inappropriate. Although the last approach is based on the correct insight about the complicity between multiculturalism and fundamentalism, it avoids the crucial question: how are we to reinvent political space in today’s conditions of globalization? The politicization of the series of particular struggles which leaves intact the global process of capital is clearly not sufficient. What this means is that one should reject the opposition which, within the frame of late capitalist liberal democracy, imposes itself as the main axis of ideological struggle: the tension between ‘open’ post-ideological universalist liberal tolerance and the particularist ‘new fundamentalisms’. Against the liberal centre which presents itself as neutral and post-ideological, relying on the rule of the Law, one should reassert the old leftist motif of the necessity to suspend the neutral space of Law.

#### Failure to focus on the economy props up capitalism

Slavoj Zizek, famous philosopher, 1999, The Ticklish Subject, p. 356

Of course, one should fully acknowledge the tremendous liberating impact of the postmodern politicization of domains which were hitherto considered apolitical (feminism, gay and politics, ecology, ethnic and other so-called minority issues): the fact that these issues not only became perceived as inherently political but also gave birth to new forms of political subjectivization thoroughly reshaped our entire political and cultural landscape. So the point is not to play down this tremendous advance in favour of the return to some new version of so-called economic essentialism; the point is, rather, that the depoliticization of the economy generates the populist Right with its Moral Majority ideology, which today is the main obstacle to the realization of the very (feminist, ecological. . .) demands on which postmodern forms of political subjectiv¬ization focus. In short, I am pleading for a 'return to the primacy of the economy' not to the detriment of the issues raised by postmodern forms of politicization, but precisely in order to create the conditions for the more effective realization of feminist, ecological, and so on, demands.

### Ideology Link – Hegemony

#### US hegemony only exists to further global capitalism through military interventions

John Bellamy Foster, editor of the Monthly Review, December 2001, “Imperialism and ‘Empire’,” The Monthly Review, Vol 53, No 7, http://www.monthlyreview.org/1201jbf.htm

At the present stage of the global development of capital, Mészáros insists, “it is no longer possible to avoid facing up to a fundamental contradiction and structural limitation of the system. That limitation is its grave failure to constitute the state of the capital system as such, as complementary to its transnational aspirations and articulation.” Thus it is here that “the United States dangerously bent on assuming the role of the state of the capital system as such, subsuming under itself by all means at its disposal all rival powers,” enters in, as the closest thing to a “state of the capital system.” (pp. 28-29). But the United States, while it was able to bring a halt to the decline in its economic position relative to the other leading capitalist states, is unable to achieve sufficient economic dominance by itself to govern the world system—which is, in any case, ungovernable. It therefore seeks to utilize its immense military power to establish its global preeminence.[\*](http://www.monthlyreview.org/1201jbf.htm#hegemony) “What is at stake today,” Mészáros writes, is not the control of a particular part of the planet—no matter how large—putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means—even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones—at its disposal. This is what the ultimate rationality of globally developed capital requires, in its vain attempt to bring under control its irreconcilable antagonisms. The trouble is, though, that such rationality—which can be written without inverted commas, since it genuinely corresponds to the logic of capital at the present historical stage of global development-—is at the same time the most extreme irrationality in history, including the Nazi conception of world domination, as far as the conditions required for the survival of humanity are concerned (pp. 37-38).

#### Global wars are just an outgrowth of US hegemonic attempts to further capitalist order

John Bellamy Foster, editor of the Monthly Review, December 2001, “Imperialism and ‘Empire’,” The Monthly Review, Vol 53, No 7, http://www.monthlyreview.org/1201jbf.htm

Among the disquieting developments that *Socialism or Barbarism* points to are: the enormous toll in Iraqi civilian causalities during the war on Iraq and the death of more than a half million children as a result of sanctions since the war; the military onslaught on and occupation of the Balkans; the expansion of NATO to the East; the new U.S. policy of employing NATO as an offensive military force that can substitute for the United Nations; U.S. attempts to further circumvent and undermine the United Nations; the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade; the development of the Japan-U.S. Security treaty aimed at China; and the growth of an aggressive U.S. military stance with regard to China—increasingly seen as the emerging rival superpower. Over the longer run even the present apparent harmony between the United States and the European Union cannot be taken for granted, as the United States continues to pursue its quest for global domination. Nor is there an answer to this problem within the system at this stage in the development of capital. Globalization, Mészáros argues, has made a global state imperative for capital, but the inherent character of capital’s social metabolic process, which demands a plurality of capitals, makes this impossible. “The potentially deadliest phase of imperialism” thus has to do with the expanding circle of barbarism and destruction that such conditions are bound to produce.

### Impact – Nuclear War

#### The continuation of capitalism guarantees nuclear extinction.

Istvan Meszaros, Prof. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Sussex, January 2000, Monthly Review, LN

Given the way in which the ongoing tends of global development assert themselves, in a clearly identifiable way, we may have perhaps a few decades to bring to a halt their destuctiveness, but certainly not centuries. The great liberal economist, Schumpeter, used to characterize—and idealize—capitalism as a system of “productive destruction.” This was, on the whole, true of capital’s ascending phase of development. Today, by contrast, we have reached a stage when, instead of “productive destruction,” we are even increasingly confronted by capital’s destructive production, proceeding on a frightening scale. You ask: “do you think that great mass movements have a chance to blossom again” in the age of globalization and under the “third way” of European social democracy? For me the “third way” is nothing more than a wishful fantasy, in defense of the established, untenable, order. Sociologists like Max Scheler have been predicting for almost a century the merging of the classes into a happy “middle-class”—one could only wonder: the middle of what? In reality, social polarization in our time is greater than ever before, making a mockery of the old social democratic expectations of eliminating—or at least greatly reducing—inequality through “progressive taxation.” As things turned out, we saw the diametrical opposite. To give you just two, very recent, examples: 1.) according to the Budget Office of the U.S. Congress (no “left-wing exaggerator,” for sure), the income of the top 1 percent is equivalent to that of the bottom one hundred million people, i.e. nearly 40 percent of the population. Twenty years ago it was “only” 1 percent against forty-nine million, i.e., less than twenty percent of the U.S. population. Some “equalization” and “merging of the classes into one another!” 2.) In England child poverty trebled in the last twenty years, and continued to be aggravated under the “New Labour” government in the last two and a half years. The “new labour” government preaches the vacuous “third way” sermon, and practices with ever greater severity the politics of antilabor measures, imposing even such policies which Mrs. Thatcher did not dare to introduce, cutting the Welfare State in every possible way, including even the precarious livelihood of the handicapped. Only a fool can assume that this can go on forever. So, in answer to your question, I am firmly convinced that there is a future for a radical mass movement, not only in England but also in the rest of the world. Or, to put it another way, if there is no future for such a movement, there can be no future for humanity itself. If I had to modify Rosa Luxemburg’s dictum, in relation to the dangers we face, I would add to “socialism or barbarism:” “barbarism if we are lucky”—in the sense that extermination of humankind is the ultimate concomitant of capital’s destructive course of development. And the world of that third possibility, beyond the alternatives of “socialism or barbarism,” would be fit only for cockroaches, which are said to be able to endure lethally high levels of nuclear radiation. This is the only rational meaning of capital’s third way.

#### The sooner capitalism collapses the better. Structural violence is the equivalent of an ongoing thermonuclear war on the poor.

Mumia Abu-Jamal, hardcore journalist who hangs with Immortal Technique, September 19, 1998, “A Quiet and Deadly Violence,” http://www.flashpoints.net/mQuietDeadlyViolence.html

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural' violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; By "structural violence" I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting "structural" with "behavioral violence" by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. --(Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it--really? Gilligan notes: [E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. [Gilligan, p. 196]

### Impact – War

#### Capitalism leads to war and extinction

Istvan Mezaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, April 2000, Socialism or Barbarism, p. 37-38

The military dimension of all this must be taken very seriously. It is no exaggeration to say-in view of the formerly quite unimaginable destructive power of armaments accumulated in the second half of the twentieth century-that we have entered the most dangerous phase of imperialism in all history. For what is at stake today is not the control of a particular part of the planet-no matter how large-putting at a disadvantage but still tolerating the independent actions of some rivals, but the control of its totality by one hegemonic economic and military superpower, with all means-even the most extreme authoritarian and, if needed, violent military ones -at its disposal. This is what the ultimate rationality of globally developed capital requires, in its vain attempt to bring under control its irreconcilable antagonisms. The trouble is, though, that such rationality-which can be written without inverted commas, since it genuinely corresponds to the logic of capital at the present historical stage of global development-is at the same time the most extreme form of irrationality in history, including the Nazi conception of world domination, as far as the conditions required for the survival of humanity are concerned. When Jonas Salk refused to patent his discovery, the polio vaccine, insisting that it would be like wanting "to patent the sun," he could not imagine that the time would come when capital would attempt to do just that, trying to patent not only the sun but also the air, even if that had to be coupled with dismissing any concern about the mortal dangers which such aspirations and actions carried with them for human survival. For the ultimate logic of capital in its processes of decision making can only be of a categorically authoritarian "top-down" variety, from the microcosms of small economic enterprises to the highest levels of political and military decisionmaking. But how can one enforce the patents taken out on the sun and the air? There are two prohibitive obstacles in this regard, even if capital-in its drive to demolish its own untranscendable limits- must refuse to acknowledge them. The first is that the plurality of capitals cannot be eliminated, no matter how inexorable and brutal the monopolistic trend of development manifest in the system. And the second, that the corresponding plurality of social labor cannot be eliminated, so as to turn the total labor force of humankind, with all its national and sectional varieties and divisions, into the mindless "obedient servant" of the hegemonically dominant section of capital. For labor in its insurmountable plurality can never abdicate its right of access to the air and the sun; and even less can it survive for capital's continued benefit-an absolute must for this mode of controlling social metabolic reproduction-without the sun and the air.

#### Capitalism can only result in unending war

Samir Amin, director of the Third World Forum in Senegal, 2004, The Liberal Virus, pg. 23-4

In fact, the global expansion of capitalism, because it is polar¬izing, always implies the political intervention of the dominant powers, that is, the states of the system’s center, in the societies of the dominated periphery. This expansion cannot occur by the’ force of economic laws alone; it is necessary to complement that with political support (and military, if necessary) from states in the service of dominant capital. In this sense, the expansion is always entirely imperialist even in the meaning that Negri gives to the term (“the projection of national power beyond its fron¬tiers,” on condition of specifying that this power belongs to cap¬ital). In this sense, the contemporary intervention of the United States is no less imperialist than were the colonial conquests of the nineteenth century Washington’s objective in Iraq, for exam¬ple, (and tomorrow elsewhere) is to put in place a dictatorship in the service of American capital (and not a “democracy”), enabling the pillage of the country’s natural resources, and noth¬ing more. The globalized “liberal” economic order requires per¬manent war—military interventions endlessly succeeding one another—as the only means to submit the peoples of the periph¬ery to its demands.

#### Capitalism makes genocidal violence inevitable.

Internationalist Perspective, Spring 2000, “Capitalism and Genocide”, #36, Accessed 4/29/09, http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html

The immanent tendencies of the capitalist mode of production which propel it towards a catastrophic economic crisis, also drive it towards mass murder and genocide. In that sense, the death-world, and the prospect of an Endzeit cannot be separated from the continued existence of humanity's subordination to the law of value. Reification, the overmanned world, bio-politics, state racism, the constitution of a pure community directed against alterity, each of them features of the economic and ideological topography of the real domination of capital, create the possibility and the need for genocide. We should have no doubt that the survival of capitalism into this new millenium will entail more and more frequent recourse to mass murder.

### Impact – Genocide

#### Capitalism is responsible for genocide and violence.

Internationalist Perspective, Spring 2000, “Capitalism and Genocide”, #36, Accessed 4/29/09, http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html

Marxism is in need of a theory of mass death and genocide as immanent tendencies of capital, a way of comprehending the link (still obsure) between the death-world symbolized by the smokestacks of Auschwitz or the mushroom cloud over Hiroshima and the unfolding of the logic of a mode of production based on the capitalist law of value. I want to argue that we can best grasp the link between capitalism and genocide by focusing on two dialectically inter-related strands in the social fabric of late capitalism: first, are a series of phenomena linked to the actual unfolding of the law of value, and more specifically to the completion of the transition from the formal to the real domination of capital; second, are a series of phenomena linked to the political and ideological (this latter understood in a non-reductionist sense, as having a material existence) moments of the rule of capital, specifically to the forms of capitalist hegemony. It is through an analysis of the coalescence of vital elements of these two strands in the development of capital, that I hope to expose the bases for the death-world and genocide as integral features of capitalism in the present epoch.

#### Capitalism creates a system that rewards genocidal violence.

Joel Kovel, Professor at Bard, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, P. 141

Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world: nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This set-up provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self-maximization. Because money is all that ‘counts’, a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz. Africa) or inconvenient sub-sets of the population (viz. black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value or may be seen as standing in its way The presence of value screens out genuine fellow-feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accom¬panied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities.

#### Capitalism creates a world unending violence

Internationalist Perspective, Spring 2000, “Capitalism and Genocide”, #36, Accessed 4/29/09, http://www.geocities.com/wageslavex/capandgen.html

The other side of bio-politics, of this power over life, for Foucault, is what he terms "thanatopolitics," entailing an awesome power to inflict mass death, both on the population of one's enemy, and on one's own population: "the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual's continued existence. .... If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers ... it is because power is situated at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population." Nuclear, chemical, and biological, weapons make it possible to wield this power to condemn whole populations to death. Bio-politics, for Foucault, also necessarily entails racism, by which he means making a cut in the biological continuum of human life, designating the very existence of a determinate group as a danger to the population, to its health and well-being, and even to its very life. Such a group, I would argue, then, becomes a biological (in the case of Nazism) or class enemy (in the case of Stalinism, though the latter also claimed that biological and hereditary characteristics were linked to one's class origins). And the danger represented by such an enemy race can necessitate its elimination through physical removal (ethnic cleansing) or extermination (genocide).

### Impact – Environment

#### Capitalism will cause eco-doom by 2013 through global warming

Minqi Li, teaches economics at the University of Utah, August 2008, “Climate Change, Limits to Growth, and the Imperative for Socialism,” The Monthly Review, http://monthlyreview.org/080721li.php

The 2007 assessment report by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirms that it is virtually certain that human activities (mainly through the use of fossil fuels and land development) have been responsible for the global warming that has taken place since the industrial revolution. Under current economic and social trends, the world is on a path to unprecedented ecological catastrophes.1 As the IPCC report was being released, new evidence emerged suggesting that climate change is taking place at a much faster pace and the potential consequences are likely to be far more dreadful than is suggested by the IPCC report. The current evidence suggests that the Arctic Ocean could become ice free in summertime possibly as soon as 2013, about one century ahead of what is predicted by the IPCC models. With the complete melting of the Arctic summer sea ice, the disintegration of the Greenland ice sheets may become unavoidable, threatening to raise the sea level by five meters or more within this century. About half of the world’s fifty largest cities are at risk and hundreds of millions of people will become environmental refugees.2

#### Should let capitalism collapse now instead of later – key to save the environment

Glen, Barry, PhD, the President and Founder of Ecological Internet, January 4, 2008 “Economic Collapse and Global Ecology,” http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm

We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon. A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.

#### Capitalisim isn’t sustainable – collapse is inevitable

Barbara Harriss-White, Development Studies Prof @ Oxford, 2006, “Undermining Sustainable Capitalism,” Socialist Register, socialistregister.com/socialistregister.com/files/ecolbhweh19Oct06.doc

Capitalism is not fixing the environment. It is not able to, either in theory or in historical practice. Market-driven politics has ensured that renewable energy remains far from the point where it might start to form any kind of technological base, either for an alternative model of capitalist development (in the UK or in an engagement with large developing countries which are about to enter a highly polluting phase of industrialisation ), or for the remoralised and equitable allocations argued for by Altvater. In energy, there is no sign of the politics able to generate a new kind of social, non-market regulation of money and nature. Sustainable capitalism is a fiction and the politics of renewable energy are merely a reflection of the fiction.

### Capitalism = Root Cause Of Environment

#### Capitalism is the root cause of environmental destruction

Democratic Socialist Party, ENVIRONMENT, CAPITALISM, AND SOCIALISM, online edition, 2004. Available from the World Wide Web at: http://www.dsp.org.au/dsp/ECS/index.htm, accessed 8/5/07.

Thus, the capitalist private profit system is the root cause of the environmental crisis. With its inherently anarchic exploitation of both human labour and natural resources for short-term profits, capitalism is incapable of utilising natural resources in a way that meets not only the current needs of all members of society but those of future generations as well: If resources in capitalism are "freely" available, like water, air and soil, then they are treated as "external inputs" whose cost of reproduction is ignored. If, however, they are incorporated into the costs of production of capitalist firms (for example through government taxes and charges on the use of these resources) the burden of these extra costs is simply passed on to the consumer. Moreover, no capitalist government will impose taxes and charges on the use of natural resources that the major corporations deem "excessive" to their ability to maximise profits. The compartmentalisation of production under capitalism (in which each particular natural resource is the independent object of profit-making) and the self-centered rationality of each individual capitalist firm make it "cheaper" to throw away or incinerate industrial by-products than to recycle them. Thus mountains of waste and toxic waste are the inevitable result of the capitalist version of the "affluent society". Capitalism's need to maximise short-term profits also leads it to impose irrational patterns of consumption on the mass of consumers through the commodification of rational needs (for example, substitution of private automotive transport for mass public transport systems) and through manipulative advertising. To this extent, the behavior of individual consumers is a factor contributing to the ecological crisis. Capitalist ideology plays directly on this factor with its credo that "people are responsible for the crisis" or with the claim that it is caused by "excessive consumption" on the part of ordinary working people in the imperialist countries. Such arguments are a convenient means of diverting attention from the fundamentally anti-environmental nature of the capitalist mode of production — and the patterns of consumption itforces working people to adopt. Today's capitalism, with its entrenched exploitation of the "South" by the advanced capitalist "North" also places an unequal burden of pollution and environmental degradation on those economies which are newly industrialising. In a world marked by excess capacity in most major branches of industry even palliative environmental protection measures can make struggling industries uncompetitive. The economic "miracle" countries of South East Asia have also been those most blighted by environmental degradation and natural resource depletion. Uncontrolled "development" of the remaining frontier in countries like Brazil, Thailand and Burma shows no sign of differing from the destructive historical model of "slash and burn". Indeed, the rules applied by international trade organisations, such as the World Trade Organisation and the North American Free Trade Association, are invoked to undermine traditional agricultural biodiversity and systems of land management.

#### Our capitalist international system is the cause of Third World poverty, environmental crisis and overpopulation

Democratic Socialist Party, “Chapter II: Symptoms and Causes of the Environmental Crisis,” ENVIRONMENT, CAPITALISM, AND SOCIALISM, online edition, 2004. Available from the World Wide Web at: www.dsp.org.au/dsp/ECS/Chapter2.htm, accessed 4/22/06.

However, if the poor nations and humanity as a whole are being brought to the brink of environmental disaster, the responsibility for this cannot be laid at the door of the peoples of the Third World. Rather, the responsibility rests squarely with the ruling classes of the industrialised capitalist countries. The governments and big corporations of the First World have imposed on the Third World an international economic system that takes more out of these countries than it puts in and that forces the latter to deplete their environmental resources at an alarming rate. The economic exploitation of Third World countries by transnational capital, and the accompanying military-political intervention by Western governments to maintain this exploitation, is the fundamental obstacle to the social and economic changes required to eliminate poverty in those countries, bring about a decline in their population growth and take pressure off their environment.

### Capitalism = Root Cause Of Racism

#### Capitalism is the root cause of racism. The white ruling class uses it in part of a calculated effort to keep certain people exploitable.

E. San Juan, Fulbright Lecturer @ Univ. of Leuven, Belgium, 2003, “Marxism and the Race/Class Problematic: A Re-Articulation”, http://clogic.eserver.org/2003/sanjuan.html

Cox theorizes racism as a "socio-attitudinal facilitation of a particular type of labor exploitation": "The fact of crucial significance is that racial exploitation is merely one aspect of the problem of the proletarianization of labor, regardless of the color of the laborer. Hence racial antagonism is essentially political-class conflict" (1972, 208). The capitalist demonstrates his practical opportunism when he uses racial prejudice to "keep his labor and other resources freely exploitable." Race prejudice, for Cox, is not just dislike for the physical appearance or attitudes of the other person. "It rests basically upon a calculated and concerted determination of a white ruling class to keep peoples of color and their resources exploitable" (1972, 214). And this pattern of race prejudice becomes part of the social heritage so that "both exploiters and exploited for the most part are born heirs to it."

#### Capitalism is the root cause of racism

Slavoj Zizek, famous philosopher, 2008, Violence, p 101-104

But we are not dealing here only with good old racism. Something more is at stake: a fundamental feature of our emerging “global” society. On ii September 2001 the Twin Towers were hit. Twelve years earlier, on 9 November 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. That date heralded the “happy ‘9os,” the Francis Fukuyama dream of the “end of history” —the belief that liberal democracy had, in principle, won; that the search was over; that the advent of a global, liberal world community lurked just around the corner; that the obstacles to this ultra-Hollywood happy ending were merely empirical and contingent (local pockets of resistance where the leaders did not yet grasp that their time was up). In contrast, 9/11 is the main symbol of the end of the Clintonite happy ‘9os. This is the era in which new walls emerge everywhere, between Israel and the West Bank, around the European Union, on the U.S.—Mexico border. The rise of the populist New Right is just the most prominent example of the urge to raise new walls. A couple of years ago, an ominous decision of the European Union passed almost unnoticed: the plan to establish an all-European border police force to secure the isolation of Union territory and thus to prevent the influx of immigrants. This is the truth of globalisation: the construction of new walls safeguarding prosperous Europe from the immigrant flood. One is tempted to resuscitate here the old Marxist “humanist” opposition of “relations between things” and “relations between persons”: in the much-celebrated free circulation opened up by global capitalism, it is “things” (commodities) which freely circulate, while the circulation of “persons” is more and more controlled. We are not dealing now with “globalisation” as an unfinished project but with a true “dialectics of globalisation”: the segregation of the people is the reality of economic globalisation. This new racism of the developed is in a way much more brutal than the previous ones: its implicit legitimisation is neither naturalist (the “natural” superiority of the developed West) nor any longer culturalist (we in the West also want to preserve our cultural identity), but unabashed economic egotism. The fundamental divide is one between those included in the sphere of (relative) economic prosperity and those excluded from it.

### AT: Capitalism Key Space

#### Capitalism isn’t key to space – just a tactic to divert attention from exploitation

Julien Tort, UNESCO, July 28 2005, Working paper for the Ethical Working Group on Astrobiology and Planetary Protection of ESA (EWG) “Exploration and Exploitation: Lessons Learnt from the Renaissance for Space Conquest” http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL\_ID=6195&URL\_DO=DO\_TOPIC&URL\_SECTION=-465.html

The scenario in which extraterrestrial room is used as a response to the degradation of the terrestrial environment also leads us to the second question that may be asked when considering the parallel between the conquest of the West and the exploration of space. While the possibility of colonizing celestial bodies may seem distant, it diverts attention from terrestrial issues in a very real way. The paradigm of the accumulation of Capital is profoundly bound to the pollution and the overexploitation of natural resources. Likening space exploration to the discovery of America may then be misleading and dangerous. There is –most probably— no new earth to be discovered through space conquest and it is, so far, unlikely that any relief can come from outer space for environmental pain. Furthermore, even if the possibility of human settlements on other celestial bodies was likely, would it still be right to neglect the terrestrial environment, with the idea that we can go and live elsewhere when we are done with this specific planet (again a scenario that science fiction likes: see for example the end of Isaac Asimov’s Foundation)? In a way, the presentation of space as a new area for conquest and expansion tends to deny that the model of the limitless exploitation of natural resources is facing a crisis.

#### The aff has the wrong focus – we should turn away from space

Marin Parker, prof @ Leicester, 2009, Sociological Review, v. 57

Uninvited or not, business interests will continue to find their way into space. A year before the Armstrongs were watching TV, Stanley Kubrick had placed a rotating Hilton hotel and a Pam Am shuttle plane in 2001: A Space Odyssey. The brands may change, and the future will not happen as quickly as we think, but unless we imagine massive state interventionism on a Soviet scale, capitalism will go into space. Dickens and Ormrod claim that it already has, at least in terms of near earth orbit, and that the key issue is to engineer ‘a relationship with the universe that does not further empower the already powerful’ (2007: 190). In other words, a Marxist political economy of space would suggest that the military-industrial complex has already empowered the powerful, but would presumably be equally sceptical about the space libertarians' claims to be representing the ordinary citizen. Of course we might conclude from this that the answer is simply to turn away from space. The whole programme has not been without its critics, whether of capitalism, imperialism, patriarchy, techno-fetishism, bad science, bad policy making or even new world order conspiracy (Etzioni, 1964; DeGroot, 2007). Even at the height of space euphoria, in the summer of 1969, we find dissenting voices. ‘The moon is an escape from our earthy responsibilities, and like other escapes, it leaves a troubled conscience’ said Anthony Lewis in the New York Times. An Ebony opinion leader, asking what we will say to extra-terrestrials, suggested ‘We have millions of people starving to death back home so we thought we'd drop by to see how you're faring’. Kurt Vonnegut, in the New York Times Magazine, put it with characteristic élan.

### Alternative Solves – General

#### Only critique can throw off the shackles of capitalism

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College. 2000. Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” Pg. 141.

Any discussion of the public intellectual, especially in connection with the various crises framing such discussions (of the humanities, of the Left or leftist intellectuals, of the university, of the public sphere) needs to be grounded in the assumption that only as a result of sustained theoretical struggle—the contention of foundational claims made exoteric—will any genuine critique emerge from the site of theory. Also, it will only be possi¬ble to do anything more than conceal the roots of the aforementioned cri¬sis if such critiques make visible the polemics constitutive of the public sphere and if they do so by siding with the polemic of theory against com¬mon sense. This, of course, requires implicating common sense in the op¬erations of global capitalism through ideology critique. Only in this way, by defending the public “rights” of theory and the theoretical grounds of politics, will it be possible to explain anything, that is, to offer critiques of ideology and expose the structures of violence appearing (anti)politically.

#### Only the alternative can solve

Eduardo Smith, April 30, 2009, “The Economic Crisis: The Only Response is the Class Struggle,” Internationalism no150, p1

For revolutionaries there is only one solution to the crisis and that is sending capitalism once and of all to dustbin of history. This is the historical task of the world working class. But this will not happen automatically. A social revolution that will leave behind the ‘prehistory' of humanity by overcoming the exploitation of man by man, the divisions of society into classes, the existence of nations.... can only be the product of a conscious and collectively organized effort of the world proletariat. Of course this revolution will not fall out of the sky; it can't only be the result of a prolonged class struggle of which today we are only seeing the beginnings around the world. Faced with relentless attacks workers need to respond by refusing to submit to the logic of capitalism and developing the class struggle to its ultimate conclusion: the overthrow of capitalism. The task is immense, but there is no other way out.

#### We have an obligation to spread the news that capitalism is unsustainable in order to transition to socialism

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, p. 222-23

If one believes that capital is not only basically unjust but radically unsustainable as well, the prime obligation is to spread the news, just as one should feel obliged to tell the inhabitants of a structurally unsound house doomed to collapse of what awaits them unless they take drastic measures. To continue the analogy, for the critique to matter it needs to be combined with an attack on the false idea that we are, so to speak, trapped in this house, with no hope of fixing it or getting out. The belief that there can be no alternative to capital is ubiquitous and no wonder, given how wonderfully convenient the idea is to the ruling ideology.2 That, however, does not keep it from being nonsense, and a failure of vision and political will. Whether or not the vision of ecosocialism offered here has merit, the notion that there is no other way of organizing an advanced society other than capital does not follow. Nothing lasts for ever, and what is humanly made can theoretically be unmade.

### Alternative Solves – Withdrawing

#### Only by withdrawing support for the government as currently constituted, can we solve.

Tony Wilsdon, Activist and Freelance Author, September 18, 2005, The Socialist Alternative, Accessed 4/27/09, http://www.socialistalternative.org/literature/katrina/logic.html

To achieve this means breaking from giving any support to the two big-business political parties - the Republicans and Democrats. They are both fully implicated in creating the present mess we are in. We need to build a new political party to represent our interests as workers, the poor, and young people, and which points a finger at the real villains, the super-rich and the capitalist system. Freed from control by corporate sponsors, this workers' party could put forward a program that addresses our needs. It would be able to end this system of capitalism, which has been responsible for enriching a tiny group of billionaires at a time of massive need and poverty. We could then create a new democratic socialist society, where the working-class majority would have the power rather than the 1% who are rewarded under this system.

#### Only a radical rejection of capitalist practices can solve.

Adam Katz, English Instructor at Onodaga Community College, 2000, Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture.” P. 127-128.

Virno does recognize the danger that a politics predicated upon Exodus, by downgrading the “absolute enmity” implicit in the traditional Marxist assumption that class struggle in its revolutionary form issues in civil war, leads to the assumption that one is “swimming with the current” or is being driven “irresistibly forward” (1996, 203). A politics aimed at the establishment of liberated zones within capitalism under the assumption that the state will wither away without actually being “smashed” leads to the problematic one sees over and over again in postmodern cultural studies: “doing what comes naturally” as radical praxis. To counter this, Virno redefines the “unlimitedly reactive” “enmity” of the “Multitude” in terms of the “right to resistance” (206): What deserve to be defended at all costs are the works of “friendship.” Violence is not geared to visions of some hypothetical tomorrow, but functions to ensure respect and a continued existence for things that were mapped out yesterday. It does not innovate, but acts to prolong things that are already there: the autonomous expressions of “acting-in-concert” that arise out of general intellect, organisms of non-representative democracy, forms of mutual protection and assistance (welfare, in short) that have emerged outside of and against the realm of State Administration. In other words, what we have here is a violence that is conservational (206). The decisiveness of the question of absolute enmity becomes clear if we ask a rather obvious question: What distinguishes autonomous expressions from any privatized space (say, Internet chat rooms) that withdraws from the common in the name of friendships, mutual aid, or, for that matter, networks, gated communities, or whatever? In short, nothing can lead more directly to the death of revolutionary politics than the assumption that the days of absolute enmity are over. Autonomous expressions necessarily lead to the esoteric and the singular as the paths of least resistance. Therefore (as in all Left-Nietzscheanisms), they take as their main enemy the programmatic and the decidable, transforming liberation into a private, simulacral affair, regardless of their denunciations of capitalism. I will return to this issue in the next two chapters, but I want to conclude this discussion by stressing that only theory and action that establish spaces that bring the common out into the open—before an outside (theory and judgment) so as to make visible the concentrated political-economic force of the ruling class—can count as a genuinely “new” politics.

### AT: Permutation

#### Permutation fails – too rooted in science

Chris McMillan, PhD student at Massey, 11-12-2008, “In Defence of the Hungry,” http://sewersociety.blogspot.com/

Sach’s blindness is part of a larger trend, the scientific hegemony of global problem solving. Science itself has a role to play in both the reduction of poverty and in managing environment change, but it does not consider the structuration of its own understanding. This has led to a situation where the status of global politics is considered as either moral or scientific, never human. Both social theory and politics are foreclosed from the debate – with the result that not only do we not look outside of current understanding for solutions, but human behaviour is implicitly considered to be fundamentally malleable. However, as Terry Eagleton has asserted, mountains has proved much easier to move that the structures of social life.

#### Only total rejection can solve.

Working Class Freedom, May 21, 2008, Accessed 4/29/09, http://www.workingclassfreedom.com/index.php?display=cgd.vs.activism

The socialist analysis of society shows that capitalism itself is the underlying cause of most of the problems which the social activists want to solve. The social activists attack the symptoms but ignore the cause. Social activists work to reform capitalism, socialists work to eliminate capitalism: the cause of the problems. If people eliminate the cause of the problems, the problems will not keep cropping up. Instead of trying to fix the symptoms, year in and year out, over and over again, forever, people can eliminate the cause, once. Then we can all get on with living our lives in a world where solutions actually solve problems, instead of just covering up symptoms. This approach can be emotionally difficult. It may even mean that someone dies today, who might have been saved by social activism. A simple analogy to explain the socialist perspective: If a pipe bursts and the water is rising on the floor, one can start bailing the water out while it continues to flow in, or one can turn the water off, and then start bailing. It may take a while to find the tap, and some valuables might be destroyed while searching, but unless the water is turned off, the water will continue to rise and bailing is rather pointless.

#### Complete rejection of the affirmative is necessary for anti-capitalism to be successful.

Slavoj Zizek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies in Ljubljana, 2004, Iraq: The Borrowed Kettle, p. 83-84

There is a will to accomplish the ‘leap of faith’ and step outside the global circuit at work here, a will which was expressed in an extreme and terrifying manner in a well-known incident from the Vietnam War: after the US Army occupied a local village, their doctors vaccinated the children on the left arm in order to demonstrate their humanitarian care; when, the day after, the village was retaken by the Vietcong, they cut off the left arms of all the vaccinated children. .. . Although it is difficult to sustain as a literal model to follow, this complete rejection of the enemy precisely in its caring ‘humanitarian’ aspect, no matter what the cost, has to be endorsed in its basic intention. In a similar way, when Sendero Luminoso took over a village, they did not focus on killing the soldiers or policemen stationed there, but more on the UN or US agricultural consultants or health workers trying to help the local peasants after lecturing them for hours, and then forcing them to confess their complicity with imperialism pub¬licly, they shot them. Brutal as this procedure was, it was rooted in an acute insight: they, not the police or the army, were the true danger, the enemy at its most perfidious, since they were ‘lying in the guise of truth’ — the more they were ‘innocent’ (they ‘really’ tried to help the peasants), the more they served as a tool of the USA. It is only such a blow against the enemy at [their]his best, at the point where the enemy ‘indeed helps us’, that displays true revolutionary autonomy and ‘sovereignty (to use this term in its Bataillean sense). If one adopts the attitude of ‘let us take from the enemy what is good, and reject or even fight against what is bad’, one is already caught in the liberal trap of ‘humanitarian aid’.

### AT: Capitalism Inevitable

#### Capitalism isn’t inevitable – multiple warrants disprove your wishful thinking

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard College, 2002, The Enemy of Nature, p. 115-16

What is the root of capital’s wanton ecodestructivity? One way of seeing this is in terms of an economy geared to run on the basis of unceasing accumulation. Thus each unit of capital must, as the saying goes, ‘grow or die’, and each capitalist must constantly search to expand markets and profits or lose his position in the hierarchy. Under such a regime the eco­nomic dimension consumes all else, nature is continually devalued in the search for profit along an expanding frontier, and the ecological crisis follows inevitably. This reasoning is, I believe, valid, and necessary for grasping how capital becomes the efficient cause of the crisis. But it is incomplete, and fails to clear up the mystery of what capital is, and consequently what is to be done about it. For example, it is a commonly held opinion that capitalism is an innate and therefore inevitable outcome for the human species. If this is the case, then the necessary path of human evolution travels from the Olduvai Gorge to the New York Stock Exchange, and to think of a world beyond capital is mere baying at the moon. It only takes a brief reflection to demolish the received understanding. Capital is certainly a potentiality for human nature, but, despite all the efforts of ideologues to argue for its natural inevitability, no more than this. For if capital were natural, why has it only occupied the last 500 years of a record that goes back for hundreds of thousands? More to the point, why did it have to be imposed through violence wherever it set down its rule? And most importantly, why does it have to be continually maintained through violence, and continuously re-imposed on each generation through an enormous apparatus of indoctrination? Why not just let children be the way they want to be and trust that they will turn into capitalists and workers for capitalists — the way we let baby chicks be, knowing that they will reliably grow into chickens if provided with food, water and shelter? Those who believe that capital is innate should also be willing to do without police, or the industries of culture, and if they are not, then their arguments are hypocritical. But this only sharpens the questions of what capital is, why the path to it was chosen, and why people would submit to an economy and think so much of wealth in the first place? These are highly practical concerns. It is widely recognized, for example, that habits of consumption in the in­dustrial societies will have to be drastically altered if a sustainable world is to be achieved. This means, however that the very pattern of human needs will have to be changed, which means in turn that the basic way in which we inhabit nature will have to be changed. We know that capital forcibly indoctrinates people to resist these changes, but only a poor and superficial analysis would stop here and say nothing further about how this works and how it came about. Capital’s efficient causation of the ecological crisis establishes it as the enemy of nature. But the roots of the enmity still await exploration.

#### Capitalism isn’t inevitable – our alternative can make miracles happen

Daly, Lecturer of International Studies @ University College of Northampton, 2004 (Glyn, “Slavoj Zizek: Risking the Impossible,” Lacan.com, <http://www.lacan.com/zizek-primer.htm>, Kel)

Zizek's thought is concerned crucially to reactivate the dimension of the miraculous in political endeavour. For Zizek the miracle is that which coincides with trauma in the sense that it involves a fundamental moment of symbolic disintegration (2001b: 86). This is the mark of the act: a basic rupture in the weave of reality that opens up new possibilities and creates the space for a reconfiguration of reality itself. Like the miracle, the act is ultimately unsustainable - it cannot be reduced to, or incorporated directly within, the symbolic order. Yet it is through the act that we touch (and are touched by) the Real in such a way that the bonds of our symbolic universe are broken and that an alternative construction is enabled; reality is transformed in a Real sense. The Real is not simply a force of negation against which we are helpless. In contrast to standard criticisms, what psychoanalysis demonstrates is that we are not victims of either unconscious motives or an infrastructural logic of the Real. If reality is a constitutive distortion then the ultimate lesson of psychoanalysis is that we are responsible for its reproduction. Miracles can and do happen. We are capable of Real acts that give reality a new texture and direction; acts that reflect this gap in the order of Being, this abyss of freedom. If Freud - in his theory of the unconscious - affirms an essential autonomization of the signifier, then what Zizek emphasises is an essential autonomization of the act: a basic capacity to break out of existing structures/cycles of signification. Far from being constrained by the notion of impossibility, Zizek's perspective is sustained and energised by the ontological potential for achieving the "impossible" through Real intervention. In this sense, Zizek's conception of the Real may be said to constitute both an inherent limit and an inherent opening/beginning: the radically negative dimension that is the condition of *creatio ex nihilo* and the political itself.

### AT: Gibson Graham

#### Gibson-Graham is inapplicable because they misunderstand class analysis

Rene Francisco Poitevin, Writer for the Socialist Review, 2001, “The end of anti-capitalism as we knew it: Reflections on postmodern Marxism.” http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3952/is\_200101/ai\_n8932891

One of the problems with trying to make the case for postmodern Marxism is that in order to get rid of Marxism and declare its tradition obsolete, you have to distort its legacy by constructing a straw man. This straw man-reading of Marx is predicated upon the double maneuver of collapsing Marxist history into Stalinism, on the one hand, and reducing Marxist theory to "essentialism," "totality," and "teleology," on the other. As J.K. Gibson-Graham themselves acknowledge, without any regrets, "Indeed, as many of our critics sometimes charge, we have constructed a [straw person] 'straw man.'"21 What is left out of their quasi-humorous dismissal of Marxism is the complicity of such a [straw person] straw man in the long history of red-baiting and anti-Marxist repression in this country and around the world. Also left out is the rich Marxist scholarship that was addressing their concerns long before there was a postmodern Marxist school. The fact is that postmodern Marxist's "contributions" are not as original nor as profound as they might have us believe. For example, what about the bulk of the Western Marxist tradition since the Frankfurt School? Has it not been predicated on a rejection of the economic reductionism embedded in the passage from the Preface to the Introduction to A Critique of Political Economy in which the (in)famous base/superstructure metaphor of society gets set in stone as the "official" definition of historical materialism? Or what about Horkheimer and Adorno's relentless critique of instrumental rationality? Marxism, in spite of what the postmodern Marxists want us to believe, has long been making the case for the centrality of culture and its irreducibility to economic laws, as anybody who has read Walter Benjamin or Antonio Gramsci can certify. Furthermore, postcolonial Marxism and critical theory have also been theorizing at more concrete levels of analyses the irreducibility of subjectivity to class.22 And despite the postmodern Marxist excitement when talking about class as a relational process, in fact it is impossible to tell that they are not the first ones to talk about class as a relational process, lots of Marxists before the Amherst School have been theorizing and clarifying the relational mechanisms embedded in class politics.23 Postmodern Marxism also ignores Lefebvre's urban Marxist contribution: his emphasis on the importance of experience and the everyday in accounting for social processes.24 And Marxist feminist contributions on the intersection of agency and gender with race, class, and sexuality are conveniently erased from J.K. Gibson-Graham's reduction of Marxism to a straw man.25 The fact is that when one looks at Marxism not as a distorted [straw person]"straw man" but on its own terms, taking into account its richness and complexity, Marxist theory starts to appear all of a sudden less "totalizing," "essentializing," and "reductionist" and instead as more rich in possibilities and more enabling.

#### Gibson-Graham is wrong - this approach forecloses Marxist politics

Rene Francisco Poitevin, Writer for the Socialist Review. 2001. “The end of anti-capitalism as we knew it: Reflections on postmodern Marxism.” http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qa3952/is\_200101/ai\_n8932891

And it is Marxist legitimacy that the postmodern Marxists lack and desperately seek. The Amherst School's strategy has been to lock on to Althusser's "overdetermination" and claim it as their own as a way to argue for the legitimacy of postmodern epistemologies as an acceptable part of the Marxist canon. In this way postmodern Marxists get to have their cake and eat it too. They get to reject and condemn notions of capitalism as a macro-system that is inherently exploitative -- while remaining Marxists at the same time. Thus, statements like "overdetermination enables us to read the causality that is capitalism as coexisting with an infinity of other determinants, none of which can be said to be less or more significant"11 together with sentences like "We are not arguing for the abandonment of such terms as 'working class,' but for an approach to their use that does not know in advance what they mean" get to pass for legitimate Marxist positions.12 How claims such as these, where we can neither explain capitalism nor tell what we mean by "working class," can pass for Marxist theory today, all in the name of Althusser, is beyond my comprehension. The Amherst School's sleight of hand is made possible in part because Althusser actually never fully developed his concept of overdetermination beyond some rather cryptic comments.13 But fortunately for the Amherst School, this is where post-structuralist theory can come to the rescue, making it possible for Althusserian thought to become more clear. Take for example J.K. Gibson-Graham's approach, when they say that "Althusser's overdetermination can be understood as signaling the irreducible specificity of every determination... the openness and incompleteness of every identity; the ultimate unfixity of every identity ...."14 People familiar with Derrida's work will recognize immediately that what Gibson-Graham have done is attribute to Althusser what is in fact Derrida's definition of the "sign," which for him is one of the fundamental building blocks of language. What this seemingly innocent trick by the Amherst School does is to effectively transform Althusser's "overdetermination" into a problem of language and discourse - and therefore into a post-structuralist agenda.15 This kind of post-structuralist-wolves-dressed-up-in-Marxist-clothes trick, so entrenched within the postmodern Marxist tradition, needs to be rejected and denounced. To substitute Derrida for Althusser might be a clever trick that allows postmodern Marxism to sound legitimate, but it is certainly not Althusserian Marxism.